



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

The American Catholic quarterly review

21731

THE
AMERICAN
CATHOLIC QUARTERLY
REVIEW

Under the Direction of
MOST REV. PATRICK JOHN RYAN, D. D.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS, RT. REV. MGR. J. F. LOUGHLIN, D. D., AND VERY REV
JAMES P. TURNER, V. G.

Bonum est homini ut eum veritas vincat volentem, quia malum est homini ut eum veritas
vincat invitum. Nam ipsa vincat necesse est, sive negantem sive confitentem.
S. AUG. EPIST. cccxxviii. AD PASCENT.

VOLUME XXX.
FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER, 1905.

STANFORD LIBRARY

PHILADELPHIA :
211 SOUTH SIXTH STREET.

207587

Entered according to Act of Congress,
in the year 1902,
By P. J. RYAN,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at
Washington, D. C.

Y9A9B1 0807M12

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
a'Becket, John J. Chateaubriand.....	79
Aglipayan Church, The Inside of the—Rev. Ambrose Coleman, O. P.....	368
Ahern, S. J., Rev. M. J. Scientific Chronicle....	176, 382, 608, 811
Aiken, S. T. D., Rev. Charles F. The Testimony of the Original Apostles to the Fact of the Resurrection.....	243
Ancient Commerce of the Phœnicians in the Mediterranean— Rev. J. D. Murphy, S. J.....	331, 495
Ancient Scottish Devotion to Mary—Dom Michael Barrett, O. S. B.....	311
Anglo-Roman Controversy, The—Rev. Charles Coupe, S. J...	551
Barrett, O. S. B., Dom Michael. Ancient Scottish Devotion to Mary.....	311
Barrett, S. J., Rev. Timothy. Some Remarks on Bishop Doane's Article in the <i>North American Review</i> for April, 1905	345
Barry, C. SS. R., Rev. Albert. The Higher Criticism.....	159
Bible, The Evolution of Our English—Rev. G. J. Reid.....	563
Brosnahan, S. J., Rev. Timothy. The Educational Fact..	209, 508
Buddhism and Catholicity, Tibetan—Darley Dale.....	167
California Missions, The Destruction of the—B. J. Clinch....	657
Canadian Northwest School Question, The—W. F. P. Stockley	472
Catharine II. and the Holy See (1772-1796)—Rev. T. J. Sha- han, D. D.....	1
Catholic College in the Seventeenth Century, A—Rev. L. Willaert, S. J.....	745
Catholic Mysticism, The Nature of—Rev. J. J. Conway, S. J..	685
Catholicism in Russia (1796-1825), Roman—Rev. T. J. Shahan, D. D.....	533
Catholicity, Tibetan Buddhism and—Darley Dale.....	167
Catholicity and Socialism—Rev. W. J. Kerby.....	225
Chateaubriand—John J. a'Becket.....	79
Christian Science, The Meaning of—Rev. W. M. Drum, S. J.	132
Church, The Inside of the Aglipayan—Rev. Ambrose Coleman, O. P.....	368
Clinch, Bryan J. The Destruction of the California Missions.	657
Clinch, Bryan J. University Education in Ireland.....	28

	PAGE
Coleman, O. P., Rev. Ambrose. Do the Filipinos Really Hate the Spanish Friars?.....	449, 672
Coleman, O. P., Rev. Ambrose. The Friars' Estates in the Philippines	57
Coleman, O. P., Rev. Ambrose. The Inside of the Aglipayan Church	368
Conway, S. J., Rev. James J. The Nature of Catholic Mysticism	685
Coupe, S. J., Rev. Charles. The Anglo-Roman Controversy..	551
Criticism, The Higher—Rev. Albert Barry, C. SS. R.....	159
Czar Nicholas I. and the Holy See (1825-1855)—Rev. T. J. Shahan, D. D.....	720
Dale, Darley. A Mediæval Medley.....	300
Dale, Darley. The Legend of St. Olaf of Norway.....	707
Dale, Darley. Tibetan Buddhism and Catholicity.....	167
Destruction of the California Missions, The—B. J. Clinch.....	657
Do the Filipinos Really Hate the Spanish Friars?—Rev. Ambrose Coleman, O. P.....	449, 672
Drum, S. J., Rev. Walter M. The Meaning of Christian Science	132
Early Relations of Russia and Japan, The—Donat Sampson..	625
Education in Ireland, University—B. J. Clinch.....	28
Educational Fact, The—Rev. T. Brosnahan, S. J.....	209, 508
Encyclical—Acerbo Nimis.....	417
Encyclical—The Teaching of Christian Doctrine.....	426
Encyclical—Motu Proprio, De Protonotariis.....	592
Evolution of Our English Bible, The—Rev. G. J. Reid.....	563
Filipinos Really Hate the Spanish Friars? Do the —Rev. Ambrose Coleman, O. P.....	449, 672
Friars' Estates in the Philippines, The—Rev. Ambrose Coleman, O. P.....	57
Graham, Rev. E. P. An Old Miracle and Modern Science....	759
Griffin, Gerald. E. P. Stanton.....	283
Guilds, The Religious Element in Mediæval—Rev. R. Tierney, S. J.....	647
Heliand, The—Charles G. Herbermann, Ph. D.....	791
Herbermann, Charles George. Martin Waldseemuller (Ilacomilus)	112
Herbermann, Ph. D., Charles G. The Heliand.....	791
Higher Criticism, The—Rev. Albert Barry, C. SS. R.....	159
Holy See, Catharine II. and the (1772-1796)—Rev. T. J. Shahan, D. D.....	1
Holy See (1825-1855), Czar Nicholas I. and the—Rev. T. J. Shahan, D. D.....	720

Table of Contents.

v

	PAGE
Holy See, Louis XIV. and the—Donat Sampson.....	141
Inside of the Aglipayan Church, The—Rev. Ambrose Coleman, O. P.....	368
Ireland, University Education in—B. J. Clinch.....	28
Japan, The Early Relations of Russia and—Donat Sampson..	625
Kerby, Ph. D., Rev. William J. Catholicity and Socialism...	225
Legend of St. Olaf of Norway, The—Darley Dale.....	707
Louis XIV. and the Holy See—Donat Sampson.....	141
Maas, S. J., Rev. A. J. The Newly Discovered "Sayings of Jesus"	253
Mary, Ancient Scottish Devotion to—Dom Michael Barrett, O. S. B.....	311
Meaning of Christian Science, The—Rev. W. M. Drum, S. J..	132
Mediaeval Medley, A—Darley Dale.....	300
Mediterranean, Ancient Commerce of the Phœnicians in the— Rev. J. D. Murphy, S. J.....	331, 495
Miracle and Modern Science, An Old—Rev. E. P. Graham...	759
Murphy, S. J., Rev. J. D. Ancient Commerce of the Phœnic- ians in the Mediterranean.....	331, 495
Nature of Catholic Mysticism, The—Rev. J. J. Conway, S. J..	685
Newly Discovered "Sayings of Jesus," The—Rev. A. J. Maas, S. J.....	253
Norway, The Legend of St. Olaf of—Darley Dale.....	707
Olaf of Norway, The Legend of St.—Darley Dale.....	707
Old Miracle and Modern Science, An—Rev. E. P. Graham...	759
O'Shea, John J. A Provençal Renaissance.....	268
O'Shea, John J. The Royal Line of Savoy: The Prince of Piedmont	43
O'Shea, John J. The Schiller Centenary: "Don Carlos"....	436
Philippines, The Friars' Estates in the—Rev. Ambrose Cole- man, O. P.....	57
Phœnicians in the Mediterranean, Ancient Commerce of the— Rev. J. D. Murphy, S. J.....	331, 495
Piedmont, The Royal Line of Savoy: The Prince of—J. J. O'Shea	43
Provençal Renaissance, A—John J. O'Shea.....	268
Reid, Rev. George J. The Evolution of Our English Bible..	563
Religious Element in Mediaeval Guilds, The—Rev. R. Tierney, S. J.....	647
Resurrection, The Testimony of the Original Apostles to the Fact of the—Rev. C. F. Aiken, S. T. D.....	243
Roman Catholicism in Russia (1796-1825)—Rev. T. J. Shahan, D. D.....	533

	PAGE
Royal Line of Savoy: The Prince of Piedmont, The—John J. O'Shea	43
Russia, Roman Catholicism in (1796-1825)—Rev. T. J. Shahan, D. D.....	533
Russia and Japan, The Early Relations of—Donat Sampson..	625
Savoy: The Prince of Piedmont, The Royal Line of—J. J. O'Shea	43
"Sayings of Jesus," The Newly Discovered—Rev. A. J. Mass, S. J.....	253
Sampson, Donat. Louis XIV. and the Holy See.....	141
Sampson, Donat. The Early Relations of Russia and Japan..	625
Schiller Centenary: "Don Carlos," The—John J. O'Shea.....	436
Scholfield, J. Faber. Upon This Rock.....	461
School Question, The Canadian Northwest—W. F. P. Stockley	472
Science, An Old Miracle and Modern—Rev. E. P. Graham....	759
Scientific Chronicle—Rev. M. J. Ahern, S. J.....	176, 382, 608, 811
Scottish Devotion to Mary, Ancient—Dom Michael Barrett, O. S. B.....	311
Shahan, D. D., Rev. Thomas J. Catharine II. and the Holy See (1772-1796).....	I
Shahan, D. D., Rev. Thomas J. Czar Nicholas I. and the Holy See	720
Shahan, D. D., Rev. Thomas J. Roman Catholicism in Russia (1796-1825)	533
Socialism, Catholicity and—Rev. W. J. Kerby.....	225
Some Remarks on Bishop Doane's Article in the <i>North American Review</i> for April, 1905—Rev. Timothy Barrett, S. J..	345
Stanton, E. P. Gerald Griffin.....	283
Stockley, W. F. P. The Canadian Northwest School Question	472
Testimony of the Original Apostles to the Fact of the Resurrection, The—Rev. C. F. Aiken, S. T. D.....	243
Theologians? Who Are the Real—Rev. Henry Woods, S. J..	357
Tibetan Buddhism and Catholicity—Darley Dale.....	167
Tierney, S. J., Rev. Richard. The Religious Element in Mediæval Guilds.....	647
University Education in Ireland—B. J. Clinch.....	28
Upon This Rock—J. Faber Scholfield.....	461
Waldseemuller (Ilacomilus), Martin—C. G. Herbermann.....	112
Who Are the Real Theologians?—Rev. Henry Woods, S. J...	357
Willaert, S. J., Rev. L. A Catholic College in the Seventeenth Century	745
Woods, S. J., Rev. Henry. Who Are the Real Theologians?..	357

BOOKS REVIEWED.

	PAGE
Acta Inedita—Pastor.....	409
Aubrey de Vere—Ward.....	184
Burden of the Time, The—Clifford.....	401
Catholic Ideals in Social Life—Cuthbert.....	201
Certainty in Religion—Wyman.....	618
Compendium Theologiae Moralis—Colasancio.....	623
Constitutional Law in the United States—McClain.....	404
Crux of Pastoral Medicine, The—Klarman.....	617
Cyr's Graded Art Readers.....	621
Devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus—Noldin.....	403
Dictionary of the Bible—Hastings.....	204
Die Journalisten—Freytag.....	415
Die Parabeln des Herrn—Fonck.....	205
Earth and Sky—Stickney.....	624
Elements of Botany—Bergen.....	414
Elementary Woodworking—Foster.....	415
English Monastic Life—Gasquet.....	828
Esame Critico—Morando.....	616
Feasts of Mother Church—Salome.....	408
Flaschmann als Erzieher—Ernst.....	413
Gentle Shakespere, The—Yeatman.....	820
Geschichte de Weltliteratur—Baumgartner.....	407
Gospel Applied to Our Times, The—Phelan.....	207
Handbook of Homeric Study—Browne.....	825
Historical Sketches of St. Charles' Seminary—Schulte.....	407
History of England—Cheney.....	412
History of the German People—Janssen.....	394
House of God, The—Shahan.....	391
In Many Lands.....	205
Institutiones Metaphysicae—de Backer.....	399
Ireland's Story—Johnston.....	392
Jesus Christ the Word Incarnate—Freddi.....	206
Jones Readers, The.....	623
Joseph Kardinal Hergenroether's Handbuch—Kirsch.....	197
La Mere de la Marquise, About.....	413
Legal Tender Problem, The—Kinnaied.....	405
Letters of Blessed John of Avila.....	405
Letters on Christian Doctrine—De Zulueta.....	826
Les Saints: Saint Columban—Martin.....	823

	PAGE
Life of St. Elizabeth of Hungary—Montelambert.....	202
Life of Shakespeare—Rolfe.....	398
Little Flowers of St. Francis.....	410
Little Folks of Many Lands—Chance.....	622
Lives of the English Martyrs—Camm.....	831
Meaning of the Idylls of the King—Pallen.....	623
Middle Ages, The—Shahan.....	196
Missale Romanum.....	619
Moral Briefs—Stapleton.....	204
Notes on Christian Doctrine—Bagshawe.....	831
Officium Hebdomadae Majoris.....	411
Ordo—Pustet.....	832
Pastoral Medicine—Sanford.....	408
Philippine Islands, The.....	202
Prayers and Meditations—a' Kempis.....	409
Progress in Prayer—Caussade.....	208
Psallite Sapienter—Wolter.....	411
Pulpit Orator, The—Bollner.....	200
Rosa Mystica—Best.....	207
Sacred Hymns, The—Bingham.....	406
St. Catherine de Ricci—Capes.....	824
Saints and Festivals of the Christian Church—Brewster.....	830
School Civics—Boynton.....	621
Seven Lamps for the Teacher's Way—Hill.....	623
Sequentia Christiana—Dawson.....	203
Short History of Ancient Egypt—Newberry.....	621
Sketches for Sermons—Wakeham.....	411
Socialism—Cathrein.....	194
Some Successful Americans—Williams.....	414
Spirit of Sacrifice, The—Giraud.....	400
Storm's In St. Jurgen.....	412
Story of the Congo Free State—Wack.....	829
Studies in Religion and Literature—Lilly.....	410
Suffering Man-God, The—Seraphim.....	398
Summa Theologiae Moralis—Noldin.....	199
Summula Philosophiae.....	402
Synopsis Theologiae Moralis et Pastoralis—Tanqueray.....	198, 619
Tractatus de Deo—Janssens.....	622
Tragedy of Fotheringay, The—Scott.....	620
Valerian Persecution, The—Healy.....	827
Vera Sapientia—Byrne.....	206
Whosoever Shall Offend—Crawford.....	191
Zschokke—Sanborn.....	414

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the *QUARTERLY* will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the *REVIEW* not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXX.—JANUARY, 1905—No. 117.

CATHARINE II. AND THE HOLY SEE (1772-1796).

AMONG the crowned heads of the eighteenth century none was more inimical to the Holy See than Catharine II. of Russia. Other sovereigns, Catholic and Protestant, held up to the lips of the Papacy the bitter chalice of persecution and humiliation; it was reserved for the autocrat of all the Russias to compel the Popes to drink it to the dregs. Not even the hydra-headed Revolution of the doctrinaires and Jacobins of France did so much damage to Catholic interests as this woman by her dealings with the Polish nation, the Holy See, and the Roman Catholic populations that she annexed during the last twenty years of her reign. Elsewhere in Europe the views of Gallicanism and Febronianism have been to a considerable extent counteracted and weakened; the ruins of the Reign of Terror have been partially cleared away. But the work of Catharine of Russia was done with thoroughness—not only were the immediate results of enormous importance, but all hope of restoration was shut out by her iron Byzantinism, her unparalleled cunning, and the new secularism of her policy and her measures. She robbed the Roman Catholic Church of more millions of souls than ever were in Ireland in the days of its greatest population, and she built up between them and Rome a Chinese Wall of exclusion that stands to-day, a sign and earnest of

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1905, by P. J. Ryan, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

the actual commercial and political intentions of the vast State, whose second founder she truly was. What was this woman like?

I.

Catharine was the daughter of a little German Prince, Christian of Anhalt-Zerbst. She had been brought up in ignorance and was married at 16 to the Duke of Holstein-Gottorp, who became Emperor of Russia (Peter III.) at the death of his aunt, the debauchee-Empress Elizabeth (1762), youngest daughter of Peter the Great¹. Her married life was unhappy enough, for the Emperor was an ugly, consumptive and bibulous creature, unpopular in Russia, and to her every way unsympathetic. One day (1762) she usurped his throne and caused him to be murdered. Not long after she had the pretender, Iwan VI. (son of Empress Anna, 1730-1740), barbarously put to death, after he had spent most of his sad, young life in prison. Thus opened the career of a woman who lived to affect profoundly her own State and her subjects, and to transmit to her successors an anti-Catholic religious policy that has never been abandoned.²

The lives of other Russian Empresses of the eighteenth century had been such as to make Elizabeth of England appear like a model of correctness, and to justify the work of John Knox, "Against the Monstrous Regiment of Woman" (1557). But Catharine II. surpassed all limits of decency and has left to posterity the example of the grossest personal immorality in the highest station a woman could occupy. Her paramours were State officials, treated after the fashion of the mistresses of Louis XIV., with special provision and residence—the famous "Appartement." They were often the real governors of Russia. The Orloffs and the Potemkins, and all the minor and later lovers of this great ex-Lutheran dame, were like Viceroyes in the State, and often affected in public an Oriental splendor. It is said that she squandered on these men fully eighty millions of dollars—to Potemkin she allowed not only an unhampered authority, but one-third of the revenues of all Southern Russia. Her Prime Ministers, like Panine and Bezborodko, were dissolute gamblers and indolent libertines.³

¹ Ch. Du Bouzet, "La Jeunesse de Catherine II.," Paris, 1860. Rambaud, "Catharine II. dans sa famille," *Revue des Deux Mondes*, Feb., 1874.

² Voltaire has this to say of the death of Peter III.: "On parle d'une colique violente qui a delivré Pierre Ulric du petit désagrément d'avoir perdu un empire de deux mille lieues. . . . J'avoue que je crains d'avoir le cœur assez corrompu pour n'être pas aussi scandalisé de cette scène qu'un bon chrétien devrait l'être. Il peut resulter un très grand bien de ce petit mal . . . et d'ailleurs quand un ivrogne meurt de la colique, cela nous apprend à être sobres." Nourisson, *Voltaire et le Voltairanisme*, p. 347.

³ De Vêrac, the French ambassador, wrote: "Quand on est témoin de la

Much has been written of her efforts to renovate Russia—there was certainly a vast field for her labors. We do not need to deny the improvement of roads and communication, the attempts to colonize and improve Southern Russia and to create cities and centres of commerce, her interest in French letters and the fine arts as represented by the French scholars, architects, painters and sculptors she employed. St. Petersburg is really a creation of French genius. She imitated as far as possible the French Academy and Madame de Maintenon's school of St. Cyr. In a huge educational establishment built at Moscow she educated many thousands of young Russians, somewhat on the plan of Alexander when he educated the thirty thousand young Persians in his brand-new Greek schools, that they might forget to love their fatherland and adore the conqueror. It is true that she succeeded, superficially, in changing an Asiatic into an European power.

On the other hand, she permitted the great majority of her subjects to live in abject misery through fear of her own powerful nobility and wealthy subjects. Her famous "Instruction pour la confection d'un nouveau code," all filled with plagiarisms from the humanitarian writings of Montesquieu and Beccaria, was held to be a huge joke and a comedy by foreign observers at her court. The great meeting of 652 deputies at Moscow, representing every Russian estate and interest, except the bulk of the unhappy serfs, recalls the late meeting of the Zemstvos at St. Petersburg. It ended only in riveting more tightly the chains of the popular slavery. What that was like may be learned from the story of Daria Soltykof and her serfs (Lavissee-Rambaud, VII., 440). The poor man in her vast domains had security, for she almost never interfered with the rights of the proprietors, and herself increased the number of unprotected serfs by donating many thousands of crown-serfs to her discarded lovers, who thenceforth treated them as private property.

The population of Russia remained ignorant and abandoned, while she corresponded with Voltaire and Diderot⁴ and wrote "comédies de mœurs" or indulged her violent passions.⁵ The stupid

vie dissipée à laquelle ils se livrent l'étonnement n'est pas que les affaires se fassent mal: l'étonnement est qu'elles se fassent, Lavissee-Rambaud, "Histoire Générale" (Paris, 1896), VII., 437.

⁴ Pingaud, *Les Français en Russie*, *Revue des Deux Mondes*, April 15, 1900. For the correspondence of Catharine with Voltaire, Diderot, D'Alembert, Falconet and others, cf. Rambaud, *Revue des Deux Mondes*, March, 1877.

⁵ A Russian writer, M. Bilbassof, began not long ago a complete history of Catharine II. The first volume (in Russian) appeared in 1890, whereupon it was forbidden in Russia—so scandalous is yet at St. Petersburg the true history of "Sainte Catherine." It was then translated into German, and, with the second volume, was published at Berlin in 1892. Cf.

ignorance of her people was made evident when they slaughtered the Archbishop of Moscow because he interfered with their superstitious conduct during the awful pest that decimated that city in the summer of 1771. Her reign was characterized by many savage "jacqueries" of the misguided multitudes who followed after every impostor like Pougatchef, in the vain hope that Peter III. had come to life again and would relieve their miseries. Her political reforms were superficial and worthless, for she could not affect the true source of the universal robbery and corruption—the characters of the men to whom all Russian interests, civil, military and naval, were confided. Her own household was an open pestilential source of immorality in all its most glaring and scandalous forms. Her boasted civilization was only a thin veneer that revealed easily the fierce untutored barbarism which it was meant to hide and not transform. Under the hypocritical pretext of reforming her own church she confiscated the lands and revenues of the monastic corporations, only to waste this wealth on her lovers, on unmeaning and unsuitable attempts at the improvement of Russian life among those already comfortable. She had forever in her mouth the words of tolerance, humanity, equality, religious liberty, and was nevertheless the most intolerant and oppressive of all rulers. Such a woman could have existed only in the Russia of the eighteenth century, and only in a land where all ecclesiastical spirit and liberty had long since been seared as with a hot iron and the mouths of the clergy made dumb with fright or stopped with secular gifts and advantages. It was to this woman and her officials, civil and ecclesiastic, that the helpless Roman Catholics of Poland were turned over between 1772 and 1796. What she did to them and what obstacles she put in the way of the reunion of Christendom, and the spiritual elevation of the Russian people themselves, is a chapter of history that needs to be pondered carefully if we would understand the relations between Russia and the Holy See in the century that has closed.⁶

M. K. Walliszewski, "Le Roman d'une Impératrice, Catherine II. de Russie, d'après ses mémoires, sa correspondance et les documents inédits des archives d'Etat," Paris, 1893, 80. This work contains quite curious details concerning her private and public life. Cf. Nourrisson, *op. cit.* p. 351. The same author has also written another work on the court and surroundings of Catharine, "Autour d'un Trône," Paris, 1894.

⁶ Many papers and documents of the reign of Catharine, in their original text, as well as much of her correspondence, may be found in the volumes of the very extensive Russian "Collection de la Société Impériale;" other materials are in the great (Russian) work known as "Old and New Russia." The published legislation of Catharine is found in the "Collection complète des Lois Russes" (40 vols.). The treaties of her reign are in the second volume of Martens' "Recueil des traités, conventions," etc. There exist a great many curious and valuable memoirs of her reign, both in Russian and

II.

Three points are worthy of note in the dealings of Catharine with Catholic Poland—her promises to Europe in general, her promises to Poland and the measure of execution she gave to her promises and her treaties. Before the Europe of her time she poses as the protectress of her oppressed co-religionists and of all the dissidents in Poland. She laments publicly their unhappy condition, and poses as a magnanimous Princess defending in the name of outraged conscience and broken treaties the natural liberty and equality of the human race. The "*bonheur du genre humain*" is so dear to her that she is ready to take up arms to extend it to all men. As to the integrity of Poland, sorely threatened by the constant interference of Russia, she asseverates most solemnly (June 9, 1764) that she has no designs upon the territory of Poland; rather will she return all that belonged to that kingdom by the treaty of Moscow (1686), and thenceforth defend and protect its just and legitimate possessions. When she wrote these words she had already signed a treaty with Frederick the Great, on March 3 (April 11), 1764, in which both agreed to maintain the frightful internal anarchy of Poland and to prevent any consolidation of the royal authority. After the election of her puppet candidate and former lover, Stanislaus Poniatowski (August 7, 1764), she began anew her intrigues against the peace and welfare of this sorely troubled nation.

It is well to remember that at this time Poland was substantially a Catholic land. Of its eighteen million souls (*Les-coeur*), only four millions were dissident (Russian and Protestant) and two millions were Jews and Musselmans. The constitution recognized the Catholic religion as the State religion. The Protestants and the Orthodox had full liberty of worship, though they were not allowed for evident reasons to exercise public functions. Catharine covered her first attacks with the approval and coöperation of the Protestant courts of England, Norway, Denmark and Sweden, which chivalrously demanded for the Polish dissidents rights and privileges that they did not allow to their own Roman Catholic subjects—all this in the name of "the happiness of the human race" and of the humanitarian principles of the encyclopedists. By misrepresentations on the part of her ecclesiastical agents, by intrigues and acts of violence on the part of her

in Western languages, *e. g.*, the memoirs of De Ségur (Paris, 1824-1859), and Algarotti, "*Lettres sur la Russie*," Paris, 1769. Formal histories of her reign have been written by Tooke (in English), Leclercq, Soumarakof, Lefort, Jauffret (Paris, 1860), Solovief (vols. XXV.-XXIX. of his *Russian History*, Moscow, 1875-1879) and Brückner, in the Oncken collection, Berlin, 1883.

civil representatives, by lying promises and assurances of her own "coeur de mère," and with the unjust complicity of the northern Protestant courts, she attempted to force from the Polish Diet and Crown what she called "the sacred rights of the dissidents." This meant in the circumstances of the time a hopeless continuation and increase of the political anarchy that had been prevalent in Poland for centuries. That it was not an honest zeal for religious equality on the part of Catharine or the northern courts is evident from the fact that their Roman Catholic subjects continued to groan under all the disabilities of the past. We have only to recall the legal conditions of the great majority of the Irish people in the time of Catharine, both as to Church and State. As a matter of fact, says Lescoeur (pp. 1-2), the kingdom of Poland was at this period "the only nation in which the dissidents (from the national church) had full and complete liberty of belief and worship." Certainly the Protestant kingdoms of Europe were at this time in open contradiction with their own constitutional principles and administrative praxis when they undertook to impose on Poland what was practically a new constitution, while they forbade her at the same time to remedy the mortal defects of the older one.⁷

The year 1764 is a fatal one in the annals of Poland. It marks the election of her last King under circumstances of extraordinary humiliation, the secret treaty between Frederick and Catharine that consummated the downfall of the kingdom, and the beginning of a series of internal dissensions that arose partly from the mutual jealousies of the quasi-royal magnates of the kingdom, partly from an inveterate habit of external interference in Polish politics, and partly from the absence of cohesion in the different estates of the kingdom. Patriotic and religious and brave the Poles certainly were, but far-seeing and self-controlled and consciously concordant for their country's welfare they as certainly were not. The wretched

⁷ For the Catholic view of the pretext of the dissidents, cf. "Jus dissidentium in regno Poloniæ seu scrutinium juris in re ad rem theologicam juridicam," Varsaviæ, 1736; Lengenich, "Jus publicum regni Poloniæ," Gedani, 1735; Zaluski, "Conspectus nov. coll. leg. eccl. Polon. Varsaviæ, 1774. The dissident contentions are in "Jura et Libertates dissidentium in regno Poloniæ," Berlin, 1707. The works of Janssen and Klopp give a Catholic treatment of the subject. Cf. Luedtke in Wetzer and Welte, "Kirchenlexicon," III., 1857-1861, and for the Protestant view Reimann, "Der Kampf Roms gegen die religiöse Freiheit Polens," 1573-1574, in Sybel's *Historische Zeitschrift*, 1864, XIII., 379, "a treatise," says Cardinal Hergenroether (III., 128), "to be read with much caution and reserve." There are numberless accounts of the fall of the Polish state, all colored by the views and principles of each writer; cf. Rulhière, "Histoire de l'anarchie de Pologne," Paris, 1807; Raumer, "Polens Untergang," Leipzig, 1832; Johannes, Janssens, "Zur Genesis der ersten Theilung Polens," Freiburg, 1865, and "Russland und Polen vor 100 Jahren." Cf. also Onno Klopp, "Friedrich II.," Schaffhausen,

disunion and cross-purposes of their Diets during this decade, notably those of Radom (1767) and of Warsaw in the same year, enabled Russia to interfere effectively with the last stages of their national independence, to bring her troops permanently into Polish territory, and to put cruel enmities between the national government and the righteous sentiments of the people. The Confederation of Bar (in Podolia), though quite in keeping with similar military uprisings in Poland from time immemorial, and bravely sustained by most of the great magnates, dwindled constantly in importance during the five years of its existence (1768-1772). However, it begat the Russo-Turkish war of the same period, out of which the Muscovite issued with much military and naval glory, owing to the lamentable corruption of Turkish officialdom, but the full fruits of which were on all sides denied to Russia, as was the case a century later when the treaty of San Stefano was so amended at the Conference of Berlin as to divide unequally the spoils of war; this time, however, at the expense of Moslem Turkey. Now, however, it was Christian and Catholic Poland who must indemnify Russia for the losses caused by the powerful jealousy of Austria, backed up by the secret encouragement of her nominal ally, Frederick.

The latter had long since proposed to Catharine, and now urged strongly the partition of Poland; and as Austria was nibbling at the territory of the "Republic," the occasion seemed finally favorable.⁸ The most enormous political crime of modern times was consummated in the spring of 1772 between the chanceries of Berlin, St. Petersburg and Vienna. Some timidity characterized the action of the latter court, which Frédéric rudely but truly characterized when he saw that Marie Thérèse "wept continually, but took her share as regularly." The excuse given to astonished Europe was unhappily, in fact, only too true: "the general confusion of the affairs of the Republic by reason of the discords of its magnates and the perverse temper of its citizens." Of the population thus unjustly torn from the Polish nation Austria received 2,600,000 souls, Prussia something less than a million and Russia about 1,600,000. The territory was divided, not without

1807; Raumer, "Polens Untergang," Leipzig, 1832; Johannes Janssens, "Zur Causes de la Chute de Pologne," *Revue Historique*, March, 1891, and De Broglie, "Le Secret du Roi," Paris, 1878.

⁸ To the mendacious assertions of Prussia and Russia, that they were only emphasizing ancient rights, long dormant in their archives, the Polish Diet justly replied that all such pretended claims had long since been wiped out by treaties, cessions and peaces. Weber, "Weltgeschichte," Leipzig, 1889, p. 329. If in a time of peace such titles of an unoffending state were not valid, what state of Europe, least of all Prussia and Russia, could lay claim to the inviolability of its territory?

some snarling, according to the political interests of each of the coparceners.⁹ Some twelve minor treaties were necessary to force this robbery on Poland, whose bleeding trunk was still left standing, and to finally delimitate the acquired territories. By the year 1776 the first act of the dread drama was accomplished.

Its political consequences were very far-reaching.¹⁰ Though Prussia obtained the smaller portion, it was, nevertheless, a very precious addition, for she thereby wiped out the long-standing Polish wedge between the kingdom of Prussia and the lands of Brandenburg and Pomerania, to which only a few years before she had added the greater part of Silesia that Austria had been compelled to cede. Greatest of all gains, perhaps, she made her Baltic coast continuous forever. In her half of White Russia Catharine came far short of the protectorate that she had originally hoped to exercise over Poland, to the exclusion of all other powers. Austria had risked nothing, but came off with the richer and more desirable part of the splendid booty. Russia acquired a homogeneous territory and population that had always been Russian in tongue and blood, while the strictly Polish territory confiscated fell entirely to Prussia and Austria. Prussia acquired a considerable German population and Austria some ancient Russian territory (Red Russia, Volyhnia, Podolia). Poland itself was now a State of only ten millions, whereas it had a population of some eighteen millions about the middle of the eighteenth century. Her condition was also more hopeless than ever, for the complicity of the three dividing nations made them solidary against any future reclamations of the sublime victim.¹¹

⁹ "Dans la mise à exécution les Russes procédèrent brutalement, les Prussiens avec résolution et cynisme, les Autrichiens avec une méthode imployable et des airs de pudeur revoltée. Bientôt leurs complices durent les avertir qu'ils prenaient trop. Eh quoi! Lemberg, les salines de Wieliczka, cette unique source de revenu pour le roi de Pologne! Frédéric disait à Swieten: "Permettez moi de vous le dire: vous avez bon appétit." Lavisserie-Rambaud, "Histoire Générale," vol. VII. (1896), p. 509.

¹⁰ "Prussia and Austria alike, by joining to wipe out the central state of the whole region, have given themselves a mighty neighbor. Russia has wholly cast aside her character as a mere inland power, intermediate between Europe and Asia. She has won her way, after so many ages, to her old position, and much more. She has a Baltic and an Euxine seaboard. Her recovery of her old lands on the Duna and the Dnieper, her conquest of new lands on the Niemen, have brought her into the heart of Europe. And she has opened the path which was to lead her into the heart of Asia and to establish her in the intermediate mountain land between the Euxine and the Caspian." Freeman, "Historical Geography of Europe" (ed. Bury), 1903, p. 521.

¹¹ "Cela réunira les trois religions grecque, catholique et calviniste," wrote Frederick (April 9, 1777), "car nous communions d'un même corps eucharistique qui est la Pologne, et si ce n'est par pour le bien de nos âmes

We may add with a writer (Rimbaud) not suspected of partiality towards Rome or Poland, that this crime against one of the oldest continental States, and which had so often drawn the sword to protect the West against the hordes of barbarians, troubled profoundly the conscience of Europe. The pagan law of might was now openly set up in the place of the ancient Christian international law. "Hereby was created a revolution in public law (*un droit révolutionnaire*) that authorized a priori all the conquests of the Convention, the Directory and Napoleon."

The only authoritative voice that was lifted for Poland was that of the Pope. He saw only too clearly that the suppression of the political liberty of Poland was equivalent to the ruin of Catholicism in that nation. Clement XIII. wrote (April 10, 1767) to King Stanislaus that the efforts of the dissidents could only end in the total ruin of their fatherland and that they could hope to advance their private interests only through treason to the Republic. A few days later (April 29) he wrote to the King of France as follows:

Our paternal love for you, and our desire for your true and lasting glory, suggest that we point out the occasions through which the eldest son of the Church may manifest his piety towards his Holy Mother. Your Majesty is aware that all the peoples among whom the light of the Gospel shines form but one body, the Catholic Church, of which Christ is the head. . . . Hence, if one of the members be suffering, all ought to suffer with it. Now, this is the situation of your brothers in Jesus Christ, the Catholics of Poland. The dissidents in that kingdom have left nothing undone to ruin the faith, to overthrow the most sacred laws, and to change the form of government on which depends the fate of the Catholic religion. Who can deny that to free this nation from such dangers is an object supremely worthy of your Majesty?

The France of 1767 was unequal to such "*Gesta Dei*," and no doubt the Pope was well aware of it. It was indeed in no interest of France that Poland should be divided or weakened, yet, as a matter of fact, it was the wrong-headed and inopportune intervention of Choiseul that actually brought about the partition of Poland. To his agents at Constantinople is largely owing the declaration of war by Turkey against Russia that, as we have seen, made evident the weakness of the Ottoman power, the last bulwark of Polish independence, and left the Republic at the mercy of Frederick and Catharine. Two days later (April 31) Clement XIII. wrote to the King of Spain:

In view of the terrible revolution of which Poland is a victim, it is our apostolic duty to exhibit compassion towards this orthodox people, and to implore for them the aid of the Catholic princes. . . . We appeal to the religious sentiments of your Majesty, and we implore you in the Lord to use all the counsel, good offices and zealous efforts that your wisdom may suggest, in order to succor this illustrious and innocent nation.

To the Emperor, Joseph II., he wrote about the same time, and *ce sera sûrement un grand objet pour le bien de nos états.*" His cynical blasphemy is in keeping with the magnitude of the injustice and violence of which he was the first instigator.

in similar terms of earnest prayer and exhortation. He tells him that he is the head of the Holy Roman Empire; that his is the first place in the Christian Republic, and that as such he is the protector and champion of the Catholic Church. He describes with vigor the revolting iniquity of the pretensions of the dissidents as put forth and sustained by Catharine. They are not content, he says, to abide by the laws of Poland, which treat them with the greatest humanity, but they have become so bold as to demand entirely new laws for the whole kingdom, which are detrimental to the Catholics. They insist on extorting from an independent Catholic government advantages which the non-Catholic Princes of Europe everywhere deny to their Catholic subjects. The Pope could do no more; or, rather, he could invoke the aid of the Almighty. This he did by the canonization (1767) of Saint John Canty, an illustrious theologian and professor of Cracow (1397-1471). He caused a strophe to be inserted in the office of the saint that will forever bear witness to the affection of the Holy See for the unhappy Poland:

O qui negasti nemini
Opem roganti patrum
Regnum tuere; postulant
Cives poloni et exteri.

Clement XIV., during whose reign the partition of Poland was accomplished, was no less faithful in his endeavors to obtain from the Catholic courts some measure of help and encouragement for the Confederates of Bar. And when he could do no more for the independence of the Polish nation, he remained keenly alive to the religious liberties of the new subjects of Russia. Shortly before his death he protested through his Nuncio at Warsaw against all acts detrimental to the Catholic faith. Marie Thérèse wrote to the Nuncio Visconti that no moderation or justice were to be expected from Catharine, who approved fully the cruel violence done by her agents to the churches and the persons of the Uniat Greeks. Clement XIV. wrote (September 7, 1776) to his Nuncios at Vienna, Madrid and Paris:

The recent accounts of the disasters of the Church in Poland and Russia are not calculated to confirm in the mind of the Holy Father his long-cherished hope that a vigorous intervention of the powers would secure for the Catholics of Poland and Russia that religious freedom which he implores heaven constantly to preserve for them. Let the powers at least lessen his fear of going before the tribunal of God as guilty of any omission in so grave a matter. . . . If they were unable to prevent the pre-concerted and violent dismemberment of the nation, let them at least protest in favor of the rights and prerogatives of religion.

Compare these admirable efforts with the cynical letters of Voltaire to Catharine apropos of the partition of Poland and the noble efforts of the Confederates of Bar to restore their country's inde-

pendence and greatness. The Polish confederates are declared by him to be a contagious pest; he sneers contemptuously at their pious and chivalrous manifestoes, and abuses the brave handful of Frenchmen who went to their aid. Catharine is a radiant figure in his humanitarian pantheon, and the greatest saint that the North has yet produced (December 3, 1771).¹²

In the treaty which the King and Diet of Poland were compelled to sign September 18, 1773, the eighth article reads as follows:

In the provinces ceded by this treaty the Roman Catholics shall continue to enjoy all their civil rights; with regard to their religion, the *status quo* shall be constantly observed, i. e., they shall have freedom of worship and discipline, together with all their churches and ecclesiastical properties, in the condition that they were found when they passed under the domination of Her Imperial Majesty, in September, 1772. Her successors shall not enforce their sovereign rights to the prejudice of the *status quo* of the Roman Catholic religion in the above-mentioned territories.¹³

In the same sense Catharine wrote (December 31, 1780) to Pius VI. (Theiner, II., 106):

From the beginning of our reign to the present day we have decreed and maintained within our vast empire the freedom of every one to worship unhindered the living God, without any oppression of any religion whatsoever. On the contrary, our sceptre is the support of every religion and is favorable to its followers as long as they deserve favor and perform the duties of faithful subjects and good citizens. . . . No Christian community need fear the loss of its privileges or its rites. We have just ordered that on the occasion of the death or resignation of a Uniat parish priest, the community must be interrogated as to the rite and the priest that it prefers, so that it may obtain from the authorities the priest it desires.

The real fate of the Uniat Greeks in the territory ceded to Russia was, however, made plain by the frightful massacres which immediately followed in the Ukraine. Catharine let loose wild bands of Zaporog Cossacks, who pillaged and murdered in all directions. It was an awful visitation for the Roman Catholics of both rites, and is rightly styled by M. Rambaud, the popular French historian of Russia, a "jacquerie orthodoxe." These ferocious bands of

¹² The cynical attitude of Voltaire toward all noble patriotism is only too well known. Numerous revolting specimens of it may be seen in the work of M. Nourrisson, "Voltaire et le Voltairianisme" (Paris, 1896), c. VII., "La patrie, pp. 336-374. Of the first partition of Poland he writes (May 29, 1772): "My heroine (Catharine) has acted in a more noble and useful way, by destroying the anarchy in Poland. She has given to each one what she thinks belongs to him, beginning, of course, with herself." Elsewhere he calls himself her "idolater," her "pagan," "the priest of her temple." She is "Sainte Catherine" and "Notre Dame de Pétersbourg." And this foul-mouthed avaricious man, servile at once and blasphemous, dared to preach of justice and equity, to denounce tyranny and oppression, to set himself up as the apostle of liberty! It is well known how disgusted Catharine became with the French Revolution, and how violent was the reaction which its excesses begat in her mind.

¹³ Martens, "Recueil des principaux traités," II., 149, and Theiner, "Documents annexés à l'Allocution de SS. Grégoire XIV., prononcée dans le consistoire secret," 22 Juillet, 1842, n. 3.

brigands, headed by Russian monks, swept through the Roman Catholic settlements, killing and burning. Even old men, women and children were pitilessly slain. On the same gallows were frequently hung a Pole, a Jew and a dog. Men were burned or buried alive and pregnant women were disemboweled. In a few days fifty villages and three cities were reduced to ashes. In one city of the territory of Kiew 16,000 persons were put to the sword and a well choked with corpses of tender children. It is said that as many as 200,000 Roman Catholics of both rites perished in this incredible onslaught of Russian fanaticism.¹⁴

The second partition of Poland (1792) was a still more cynical act than the first. The Poles in the meantime had begun the long-delayed work of creating a constitutional State in the modern sense, with an hereditary monarch, a bicameral system and separation of the legislative, executive and judicial powers. All Europe applauded, even Frederick William II., the successor of the great Frederick. He even allied himself with Poland for a brief while, but the advantages of the partition were still too fresh in the minds of Prussian statesmen, and the Russian thirst of violent and vindictive conquest still too unabated to permit the Polish nation to take its place in the modern world. A new excuse was added—the fear of encouraging the world-wide proselytism of the French Jacobins. In spite of the bravery and patriotism of Kosciusko almost every feature of the campaigns of 1768-1772 was repeated by the Polish nobles—discord, treason, jealousy, fear of their own serfs. As at Radom and Warsaw, so now at Grodno (1793) the members of the Polish Diet were compelled by Russian authority to give a silent consent to the act by which Russia added to her domain one-half of Lithuania, with Little Poland, Volhynia, Podolia and Polish Ukraine. Prussia acquired Great Poland and the cities of Dantzic and Thorn. Once more the Russian Ambassador was omnipotent at Warsaw—this time the brutal Igelström. The shadow-king Poniatowski ruled nominally about one-third of the ancient State of the Jagellons. Czartoryski and Radziwill, Branicki and Potocki, Sanguisco and Joblowski had done their fatherland to death by reason of their insane attachment to the most disorderly and antiquated forms of feudalism, their selfish contempt for the great mass of laboring Poles, their mutual jealousy and their frequent alliances with the foreign enemy. One last hopeless attempt of Kosciusko and a despairing faction of the people, and

¹⁴ Père Lescoeur (op. cit. below, p. 7) vouches for the authenticity of a letter of Catharine to Maximilian Zelezniak, a colonel of the Cossacks. M. Rambaud calls it a "prétendue lettre de Catharine," but admits that it was read to the Cossacks. It is a sanguinary appeal, perfectly in keeping with the character of a murderess and a debauchee.

all was over. *Finis Poloniae!* the hero cried, as he fell fighting against the greatest of Russian generals, Suwarow (1794). Warsaw succumbed, and with it the Polish State. The following year a third and last partition gave Cracow to Austria with other territory, Warsaw and the left bank of the Vistula to Prussia. The remainder fell to Russia, *i. e.*, the other half of Lithuania and what remained of Volhynia. Thus was accomplished the greatest political injustice of modern times, the disruption and extinction by a "*societas leonina*" of a civilized Christian State of Europe that had rendered countless services to all her Western neighbors through the centuries of their weakness and their gradual consolidation. In vain had Poland hurled back nearly a hundred invasions of pagan tribes and Moslem enemies, in vain raised the siege of Vienna (1671), in vain withstood the overflow of Protestantism, in vain made heroic efforts to re-create herself amid the most untoward circumstances—it was all of no avail; she perished, not so much because she was weak and obstinate, divided and wrong-headed, as because she was a Catholic nation, and because the latter half of the eighteenth century was to be the darkest period in the history of Catholicism. The clear proof of it is that throughout the nineteenth century the history of both Prussian and Russian Poland has been the history of oppressed and abused Catholicism, a long chapter of national martyrdom that our delicate modern ears may well listen to from time to time amid the outcries against China and the protests against the Ottoman Turk.

III.

Poland in the first half of the eighteenth century was the most extensive State in Europe—if we except Russia. To the east the Duna and the Dnieper flowed through its territory, to the west the Vistula and the Wartha. It reached from the Dniester and the Carpathians to the Baltic, where its possessions cut in two the State of Prussia and threatened both Russia and Sweden. Brave warriors of the Crown of Poland and Duchy of Lithuania had put together that vast State, largely at the expense of Russia, but also at the expense of the Southern barbarian pagan and the ever-threatening Turk. It is a glorious and romantic chapter of history how all this was gotten and kept, and a certain unity brought about in government and civilization, alas! too slight and superficial to withstand the fierce shocks that were to rend the land again and again until its total ruin. The population was thin and scattered, from fourteen to eighteen millions of people scattered over vast level areas (*polé*—plains—Poland), interspersed with forests, lakes

and swamps, such as Gustav Freytag and Sienkewicz have described in immortal pages.

Politically it was made up of strictly Polish lands, known as the Crown of Poland and of the territory known as the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Ethnographically it was inhabited by no less than five races—Poles, Lithuanians, Russians, Germans and Jews. Three religions divided the allegiance of the people—not to speak of the Jewish religion. With a few exceptions the Poles were Catholic, the Germans were Protestant, the Russians originally “orthodox” (schismatic). Since the Union of Lublin (1569) an uneasy peace had existed between the Catholics who formed the vast majority of the population and the dissidents (Protestants and Russians), who formed the minority—perhaps one-quarter of the nation. The Union of Brest (1595) brought a great multitude of the Russian schismatic population within the pale of Roman Catholicism. To this desirable result the Jesuits had contributed more than any other body of men. Their stupendous success in arresting the Reformation in Poland, their political services to the Crown, their merits as educators of youth and as representatives of literature and intellectual refinement, made them at once passionately loved of the nation at large and with equal intensity detested by the Lutheran ministers and the Russian “Popes.” In one sense it is true that Poland paid with the loss of its nationality for the incomparably greater gift of the Catholic faith. It was the Protestant Dissidents, sustained by Prussia, dwelling generally in the larger and more orderly cities of Poland like Dantzic and Thorn, who were the most turbulent disturbers of the internal order, and who left no stone unturned to ruin their fatherland and destroy the State of the Sigismunds and the Sobieskis.

A strong royal authority was needed in the seventeenth century to weld these loose and discordant masses. For various reasons, some of them honorable, it did not develop. The monarchy remained an elective one, the gift of the nobility, and one of the most curiously constituted of European nobilities. It was allodial, not feudal, *i. e.*, it held its lands by right of prior possession or personal conquest, and not from the King. Nor was the nobility systematically graded and organized as in the States to the west. In Poland proper an almost countless body of small nobles—the *szlachta*—was the true political power; in Lithuania it was the great magnates. Military “confederations” and more or less irregular assemblies or “dietines” were their highest expression of unity—the nobility of Poland aimed at keeping down the peasantry and weakening the royal authority. There was a representative Parliament or Diet, composed of two chambers, in the lower of which

the small nobility was dominant through its deputies, while in the upper—the Senate—the magnates were supreme. The royal ministers were named for life, and were duplicated for each half of the kingdom. At each election of a King the successful candidate must sign certain *pacta conventa*, by which the royal authority gradually dwindled away—eventually it was a painted simulacrum, totally dependent on the Diet. The ministers of the Crown, holding for life, are free to obey or not as it suits them; the “dietines” can reject by a single veto or *perhorrescit* the decisions of the Diet. The Diet itself can be “broken” by the *liberum veto* of a single noble member. From 1652 to 1704 forty-eight of the forty-five Diets were thus “broken” or dissolved; any traitor or fool could arrest the national life and obstruct all movement. To the Diet one might lawfully oppose the “confederation”—only here the decisions were taken by simple majority and no veto was allowed. It has been well said that “in Poland it was the opposition that was organized, while the government was anarchic.” The nobility was the nation—there were neither an independent peasantry nor a class of intelligent and patriotic burghers. The nobility itself was unevenly balanced. Four or five quasi-royal families, like the Radziwill and the Czartoryski, with splendid castles, vast domains and small standing armies, stood at the head of the State. After them came a dozen or more great families descended from royal dignitaries, then two or three hundred families, owning very large estates. Some twenty or thirty thousand nobles were masters of a village or two. Finally came the great mob of the *szlachta* or “little gentry,” about 1,300,000, known to the Germans as Schollen-Adel, from the insignificant clod of earth that too often constituted the estate of the *szlachic*. It was said that when the *szlachic's* dog lay down in the midst of his master's land his tail rested on the estate of a neighbor.

All sources of revenues in the State were taken up by this poor and hungry aristocracy—clerical dignities and benefices, public charges, the judicial offices, even the legal profession. They were exempted from taxes and obtained free salt from the King's only source of revenue, the salt mines of Wieliczka. The German cities like Thorn, Dantzic, Culm and Magdeburg had a higher and more settled civil life, and enjoyed their own rights and customs. The Polish cities like Gnesen, Posen, Cracow and Plock, the Russian cities like Kiew and Smolensk, and the Lithuanian cities like Wilna and Grodno, were inhabited largely by Jews, in whose hands were industry and commerce, banking and the collection of taxes. There was almost no Polish Catholic bourgeoisie; the tyranny of the nobles had nearly everywhere killed off all spirit

of progress and prostrated all national industry and commerce. The once free peasantry was gradually enslaved and bound to the glebe. In time even the King was forbidden to protect him, and so he became a chattel of the Polish noble. Indeed, he owed the first improvement in his lot to Russia, and not to his native master. In 1778 an English traveler declared that the peasants of Poland were the most wretched human beings he had ever seen. The peasant had "ni loi ni roi;" the consequence was that his strong arm was wanting in the hour of national defense, and the State fell that had known how to do great military deeds, but had not known how to protect the poor Christian man or do him justice.

If we add to this wretched picture of maladministration and lack of justice the miserable condition of the finances and the army, we shall cease to wonder why the bravery of the Polish nobles failed to save their politically decadent nation. In 1764 the King received from Poland a little over one million dollars, from Lithuania less than four hundred thousand—all his revenues did not amount to more than two million dollars, or one-sixtieth of the revenues of the King of France. His land was open on all sides to invasion; his army was only the "levée en masse" of the noble cavaliers, who stayed with him or returned at their pleasure. Every smallest noble was a royal elector and a little sovereign, who came and went as best suited him. Such as the army was, the small nobles eagerly grasped at all the military offices; the regiments were bought and sold; the artillery corps counted scarcely 100 men, and a boy of 15, a Sapieha, was chief artillerist! The arsenals were empty, there were almost no fortresses in a land on all sides exposed to the longing greed of its enemies. "Every citizen was a soldier, yet there was no army." Nevertheless, a Radziwill could lead 10,000 men to the Confederation of Bar, and a Czartoryski and a Potocki could also muster many thousands—infantry, uhlans, dragoons and Cossacks.

It ought not to surprise us, therefore, to read that on six or more occasions since 1518 the question of partitioning Poland had been discussed among her neighbors—at least, in every election of a Polish King, Russia, Prussia and Austria, France and Sweden are more and more openly interested and further, now by intrigue and seduction, again by threats and actual violence, the claims of their respective candidates. Usually it is the candidate of Russia, Prussia or Austria who is chosen, whereupon all Europe breathes freely at the removal of the war scare that in the eighteenth century was more or less chronic apropos of the Polish succession.

IV.

Among the articles of the treaty of Grodno (1793) that regularized the second partition of Poland was one that guaranteed the religious liberties and rights of the Roman Catholics, this time with specific mention of both rites:

The Roman Catholics of both rites who come under the sceptre of Her Imperial Majesty shall not only enjoy the full and free exercise of their religion throughout all the Russias, in conformity with the system of toleration that has been introduced there, but they shall also be secured in the ceded provinces . . . in the strictly actual condition of their hereditary possessions. *Her Majesty the Empress promises, irrevocably, for herself, her heirs and successors, that she will forever maintain the said Catholics of both rites in the undisturbed possession of their prerogatives, properties and churches, the full exercise of their worship and discipline, and of all the rights attached to their worship.* She declares for herself and her successors that she will never exercise her sovereign rights to the prejudice of the Catholic religion of both rites. (Theiner, op. cit. II., 110.)

But who even then imagined that this agreement would be observed by an unprincipled daughter of Anhalt? She had been brought up in the principles of German Lutheranism (*cujus regio illius religio*), and had in any case long since bade adieu to any sense of shame or Christian morality. Moreover, she was only too anxious to cause domestic oblivion of her own evil deeds by leaving a free hand to the immemorial hatred of the Byzantine clergy of Russia, and by the encouragement of an unjust and ignorant popular fanaticism against the Poles. The Banquo-like ghost of her murdered husband and predecessor, Peter III., would not down among his outraged subjects—so she found a new vent for the anger that threatened herself on all sides. The “Rusky Bog” should be glorified,¹⁵ a crusade against the Latin West be led in His name, Holy Russia be faced toward Jerusalem (and Constantinople), its hegemony established over all the Christian populations of the Balkans and the empire of Constantine be renewed in the successors of the Romanoffs! In the soul of Catharine there dwelt beside the superficial pseudo-humanitarianism of the encyclopedists no little of the uneasy political mysticism that the Czars had inherited from their Byzantine models, likewise a very large measure of the contempt and hatred of Rome that the clergy of Constantinople had for cen-

¹⁵ The Rusky Bog (Russian God) is the national form of jingoism or chauvinism. “It is something,” says Padre Tondini, a most authoritative and not unsympathetic writer about Russia, “akin to the temper of Israel when it interpreted materially the glorious spiritual prophecies that God had made to it. It reads and interprets all history in the light of a divine vocation for Russia as the head of the Orient, apart from and every way superior to the Latin West. The only unity of the West is in the Pope; therefore is he the enemy of the Czar and the rival of the Russian people. But this God of Russia has always used the Roman Bishop as an instrument for the execution of His designs upon His chosen people!” Cf. P. Semerla, “La Chiesa Greco-Russa,” Genova, 1904, p. 31.

turies maliciously nourished in the Russian heart against the day when that clergy would be itself powerless to propagate the evil virus.¹⁶ If we add her Protestant German training and sentiments and her total absence of moral principle, we shall be able to understand a priori the animus of her dealings with the great masses of the Roman Catholic population who were now completely at her mercy.

The principal weapon of Catharine was an entirely new one in the varied history of European politico-ecclesiastical diplomacy: she confided to a shameless traitor the highest ecclesiastical authority over all her Roman Catholic subjects.¹⁷ Thereby she avoided a conflict with an honest episcopate, confused the clergy, encouraged the self-seeking and unworthy among them, robbed the Uniat Greek laity of all free contact with the source of Catholic strength—the Holy See—and established an absolute Catholic Pope of her own making and ever under her own control. Scarcely had she acquired her share of the first partition of Poland when of her own initiative and without any Papal approval she created in the annexed White Russia the episcopal see of Mohilev, and gave over to it the jurisdiction over all the Roman Catholics of Russia. She named as its first titular a man whose memory will always be abhorred not only by Roman Catholics, but by all who admire the natural virtues of probity, candor and equity. Through this pliant agent she became herself the Bishop of the unfortunate Uniats and taught many a lesson of advanced cunning and boldness to the shade of the Virgin Queen, hitherto her great counterpart in all public and private "villenia."

Stanislaus Siestrenczewicz Bohusz was born in Lithuania, of Cal-

¹⁶ Cf. Pitzipios, *"L'Eglise Orientale,"* Paris, 1858, and the epoch-making "Photius" of Cardinal Hergenroether (Regensburg, 1867-1869, 3 vols.).

¹⁷ It is well to remember that among the Polish clergy, even before the partition, not a few were reputed inimical to the Holy See. Stanislaus Konarski, provincial of the Piarists (Fathers of St. Joseph Calasancius, who died in 1648; they were active in Poland since 1641, and are properly known as "Regulares pauperes Matris Dei scholarum plarum"—hence "Piarists"—after the Jesuits, the chief educational force of the ancient Polish state), was an admirer of the contemporary French philosophy and author of "Religion des honnêtes gens," and an outspoken opponent of the Papal Nunciature. Among the higher ecclesiastics not a few were Freemasons; Count Podolski, the unworthy primate of Poland, and several of its Bishops were staunch adherents of the principal anti-Catholic measures. Cardinal Hergenroether, *"Kirchengeschichte,"* III., 593-594; cf. Theiner's *"Histoire de Clément XIV.,"* 1852, I., 314; II., 179, a very copiously documented work, "aber mit feichthem oft leidenschaftlichem Raisonnement geschrieben" (Card. Hergenroether, op. cit. III., 455). The Polish episcopate, like all other offices of any pecuniary value, had been entirely reserved to the nobles of the State; the parochial clergy were reckoned among the serf-peasantry and excluded from all ecclesiastical promotion.

vinist parents, in 1731. He made his studies at the University of Königsberg, also at Frankfort, Amsterdam and London, at the expense of the Calvinist Synod of his native place. He became an officer in the Prussian army, and later a captain in the Polish army, whence he passed to the service of the great house of Radziwill. It is said that his subsequent abjuration of Calvinism was due to certain hopes he entertained of marrying a rich Catholic heiress. Massalski, the Catholic Bishop of Wilna (then Polish territory), took an interest in him and ordained him priest in 1763. Later he was made parish priest, canon of the Cathedral and vicar general. In 1773 Massalski had obtained his promotion as Auxiliary Bishop of Wilna, with the purpose of providing for the spiritual needs of the territories newly annexed to Russia and still ecclesiastically subject to the diocese of Wilna. It was here that Catharine found him, another Thomas Cromwell, able and unscrupulous, and as devoted to the *cæsaropapism* of Catharine as he was inimical to the rights and interests of the Holy See. Though a born Pole, he had always fought against the interests of his fatherland, and was therefore doubly recommended to the Empress. The Holy See at first refused to acknowledge the act of Catharine in making Siestrenczewicz Bishop of Mohilev, but in the interests of the unhappy vanquished recognized him as vicar apostolic or rather, with canonical precision, as "visitator" of the churches of White Russia. He came to Mohilev in 1774. His first pastoral letter revealed the spirit in which he was to preside for fifty years over the affairs of Roman Catholicism in Russia. He declared himself the supreme pastor of all Roman Catholics in White Russia, and, by an unjustifiable usurpation, claimed jurisdiction over all the Bishops *in partibus* resident in that territory. The Papal Nuncio, Garampi, felt obliged to regularize temporarily these acts of Siestrenczewicz, as he was in need of his aid in order to execute the Papal bull suppressing the Jesuits. Later on Pius VI., caught between the dying agonies of Poland and the growing despotism of Catharine, was also compelled to yield from time to time and legalize the many acts of violent usurpation committed by Siestrenczewicz.

Thus, in 1778, he invested him, for three years, with the authority of Papal "visitator" over the Roman Catholic monasteries (chiefly Basilian and Uniat). An upright and worthy Catholic Bishop would have utilized this office for the welfare of the Church. Siestrenczewicz administered it in the interest of Russian ecclesiastical supremacy. Under the pretense of improving ecclesiastical studies he compelled the monasteries to furnish annually a certain number of students who were freed from the control of their superiors, placed under the surveillance of the Bishop of Mohilev, and sent

to such schools as he should designate, to return or not, as each one chose, to his monastery. This order implied the ruin of all monastic life and discipline. Were it not for the permission accorded to the Jesuits to open their own novitiate at Polock the treasonable plan of Siestrenczewicz would have succeeded. The real purpose of his programme of studies, dictated to him, of course, from St. Petersburg, is revealed by the following article (25):

The programme of studies to which the communities shall conform and of the languages that they shall teach shall not differ from that transmitted and prescribed by the government. It is the duty of the latter to form in its subjects an identity of sentiments and knowledge, in keeping with the laws and the circumstances of the country. We are convinced, on the other hand, that our Empress, given her exalted wisdom and the entire loyalty of her promises, will not oblige us to teach anything contrary to our religion.

He was hitherto, in the eyes of the Holy See and the Catholic world, only a "visitorator" of the Roman Catholics of Russia. Catharine gratified his ambition and satisfied her own resolution to get rid of any Polish clerical authority in the annexed provinces, by creating him Archbishop of Mohilev, in a ukase of January 26, 1782. She had already (1780) sought in vain from Pius VI. the confirmation of this intended step. In the meantime an ex-Jesuit, Benislawski, was sent to Rome to obtain the confirmation of the imperial ukase and his own nomination as coadjutor to Siestrenczewicz. Benislawski had a Catholic heart, and his elevation did tend to heal somewhat the grave wounds that Siestrenczewicz continued to inflict on Roman Catholicism throughout all Russia. The harshest Byzantinism of Catharine awoke no resentment in the Archbishop of Mohilev. In the ukase of his nomination he read and applauded the thirteenth article:

It is forbidden to receive bulls and briefs coming from Rome in the name of the Pope. These bulls and briefs should be at once sent to the Senate. The latter, when it is satisfied that they contain nothing foreign to the laws of the land or the God-given authority of the monarch, will make them known to Her Majesty and await her good pleasure to publish them.

The preceding article (12) was also very injurious to the welfare of Roman Catholicism in a land like Russia and the ancient Russian provinces of Poland, where the monasteries had from time immemorial been intimately connected with the spiritual life and the temporal well-being of the poor and suffering peasantry:

The Archbishop shall send to the court a detailed account of the condition of the religious houses. He will make known how many devote themselves to the education of youth; how many to the care of the sick and the poor, and thus deserve the protection of the government; also who are those who pass their time in idleness and live a way quite useless to their neighbors.

In the hands of the Archbishop of Mohilev this meant the keeping of a "liste noire" of all the Roman Catholic monks of Russia, with all the evils consequent upon such a wretched system of

espionage. Indeed, from this time there went on a constantly increasing persecution of all the monasteries of men and women until at the present writing one may say that the once widespread Catholic monastic system of spiritual service, instruction, prayer and charity is about extinct throughout the entire Russian share of the old Polish State.¹⁸

Pius VI. recognized finally the archiepiscopal see of Mohilev by the bull *Onerosa pastoralis officii* (April 15, 1783), after all due canonical measures had been arranged with the Papal Nuncio at Warsaw. He also agreed to the choice of Benislowski as coadjutor of Mohilev, but reserved to himself any future division of an archdiocese that reached then to the confines of China. He accorded to the missionary prefects of Moscow, Petersburg and the Chersonesus seats in the chapter of the new Archbishop. He granted to Siestrenczewicz ordinary jurisdiction only over the Roman Catholics of Latin rite; for the Uniat Greeks he received only delegated powers. This did not prevent him from assuming the office and airs of a spiritual dictator and furthering in all possible ways the will of Catharine and the long-cherished designs of her imperial chancery.

He placed himself particularly at their disposal for the purpose of exterminating the Uniat Greek communities and incorporating them with the Russian ecclesiastical system. This was, indeed, the ultimate aim of all his acts, or rather of all the measures that the imperial chancery executed through him as through a soulless and spiritless dummy. He was a very ambitious man, and gave himself out as the sole metropolitan of both rites throughout the vast empire of Russia. In public documents he wrote himself down with unblushing mendacity a "legatus natus a latere" of the Holy See. Through the intercession both of Catharine and of Paul I. he sought to obtain a Cardinal's hat. This last insolent humiliation both Pius VI. and Pius VII. firmly resisted. He died in 1826, having betrayed both officially and outrageously every interest of the Roman Catholic Church since 1772, *i. e.*, for forty-

¹⁸ The Russian Government has declared an open war against all teaching orders like the Jesuits, the Piarists, the Lazarists. No convent can devote its labors to the teaching of youth, not even the Sisters of Charity, who are only tolerated. Their novitiate is suppressed; they are cut off from the authority of the Lazarists, and from all French direction. Those who were still living in 1860 were old and feeble, confined to hospital service and incapable of any of the services that Catholics might rightly expect from Sisters of Charity. At that date the religious orders in the old Kingdom of Poland could yet receive novices; it is the Russian purpose to first totally exterminate Roman Catholicism in the provinces annexed to the empire. In the meantime it affects a show of relatively less iniquitous measures in Poland proper. Lescoeur, "L'Eglise Catholique et le Gouvernement Russe," Paris, 1903, pp. 158-159.

four years. To her greater sorrow, however, his mantle fell upon another Pole who was, if possible, a still greater traitor—Joseph Siemachko—and to whom was also granted an exceedingly long life of official villainy (he died only in 1868).

V.

After the third partition of Poland (1795) an act of supreme injustice was committed by Catharine, with the approval of the Archbishop of Mohilev. She placed all Roman Catholics in her vast dominions under the control of the "College of Justice" established by her for the affairs of Inland, Esthland and Finland, *i. e.*, for entirely Protestant territory. The Catholic discipline was surely in capable and worthy hands after that measure, and the Semiramis of the North might feel satisfied that she was observing with punctilio the treaty of Grodno made two years earlier (1793), in which she promised "irrevocably" to maintain the "free" exercise of the Catholic religion for both rites. It is true that after her death Paul I., moved by the gross injustice of this act, withdrew the Roman Catholics of Russia from the control of this anomalous bureau of Russian schismatic laymen, and created a Roman Catholic "College of Justice," but always with Siestrenczewicz at its head. It was the nucleus or first shape of the later "Catholic College," or department of worship that has since been adapted again and again to the needs of Russian diplomacy, but remains yet an instrument of humiliation for all Catholics, and of oppression for the persecuting Russian State.

In his history of Roman Catholicism in the domains of the Czar an authoritative Russian statesman acknowledges that the purpose of Catharine was the complete exclusion of the Pope from the exercise of any disciplinary authority over the Roman Catholics of her empire, especially any influence of the higher Polish ecclesiastics and the Nuncio at Warsaw. She accomplished the revolution, he admits, by prohibiting the publication without her consent of any Papal communication with the Roman Catholics of her State. At the same time, he adds, she guaranteed *liberty* of worship and *organized* the administration of the Roman Catholic Church. It would be hard for Count Tolstoi to contradict himself more clearly and to exhibit more effectively the mendacity and hypocrisy of Catharine. He admits that no Pole or even impartial European has yet had the courage to do justice to that "grande souveraine," but maintains that she saved Roman Catholicism in Russia by the institution of a strong local authority and the establishment of regular dioceses. It is only necessary to say that her conduct

resembled the play of "Hamlet" with *Hamlet* left out—the administration of the Roman Catholic Church being as much a part of its essence as its teaching. The Febronians and Josephites of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries cannot answer the arguments of the Russian statesman; that is reserved to those who maintain the divinely-given independence of the Holy See. Tolstoi lauds to the skies the character of Siestrenczewicz, his curbing of the monastic independence and his reformation of ecclesiastical studies, especially his introduction of the Catéchisme de Montpellier—a work put by Rome on the Index of forbidden books. He is particularly pleased with the programme of the Archbishop of Mohilev for the teaching of canon law—it was to be taught within the limits traced by Her Imperial Majesty for the Catholic Church within her empire and protected by her. The idea of Siestrenczewicz is thus emphasized by Tolstoi himself, who thereby exhibits his clear intelligence of the consequences of this most cowardly and shameful act that a Catholic Bishop could imagine, short of formal apostasy.¹⁹ This author, speaking in the name of all Russian diplomacy, recites with approval all the blameworthy acts of the Archbishop of Mohilev, and with a truly Byzantine cynicism taunts contemptuously the Holy See with its approval of many acts of the traitor, an approval, as we have seen, granted as a lesser evil and in view of the great sufferings of the oppressed Catholics of both rites; at a moment, too, when the Holy See could no longer appeal to a single Catholic State for any political support. We may here insert a passage from the famous letter of Catharine to Pius VI., in which, with unparalleled audacity and insolence she demands for the Bishop of Mohilev the archiepiscopal pallium:

"As to the person of the Bishop Siestrenczewicz, Illustrious Sovereign, accused of having exceeded your rescript and of abusing the power you gave him, we will not leave unanswered this accusation. Though we tolerate, as did our ancestors, all forms of worship in our vast provinces, and among them the Roman religion, we cannot consent that its votaries should in any way whatsoever depend upon a foreign power; hence throughout our empire we do not permit the bulls of the Roman See to be published except by our order." That is why, she adds, Siestrenczewicz was able to open a Jesuit novitiate, in spite of the Pope, and by her orders. The bull of Clement XIV. suppressing the society had not been published in Russia. "Is it possible," she goes on, "that in the accomplishment of the duties of his oath he could incur your reproaches and make himself unworthy of receiving from you the archiepiscopal dignity and the pallium? That dignity, being a degree of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, has always and everywhere been subject to the sovereign power, even among potentates of the Roman Catholic religion, rulers who hold themselves in a measure as subject to the Papal authority in spiritual matters. This sovereign right is especially incontestable in our empire. Impelled by his zeal for the Roman Church, for the perfect administration of his flock, and for all his efforts in favor of public unity, we have determined to elevate Siestrenczewicz to the

¹⁹ Ap. Lescoeur, p. 30. The memoir of Siestrenczewicz referred to by Tolstoi is printed by him (II., 436) from the original in the archives of Moscow, and is entitled "On the Hierarchy of the Catholic Church in the Empire."

dignity of Archbishop of Mohilev. . . . We pray you, Illustrious Sovereign, merely in order to preserve the customs of the Roman Church, to send to the new Archbishop the pallium, and to consecrate his coadjutor. We shall hold this an agreeable condescendance on your part, and in turn, when occasion offers, we shall not refuse to reciprocate the courtesy. We unite our prayers with those of our orthodox Church, which offers up its petitions for the reunion of all."

This letter, swarming with lies and historical ignorance, was written to the heroic Pius VI. in favor of a Roman Catholic Bishop on the morrow of the first partition of Poland and on the eve of the French Revolution. In it there speaks not so much the heart of Holy Russia as the embittered Lutheran, rejoicing in the hour when she can inflict on the head of Catholicism a disgrace that knows no parallel, and which was mitigated by only one consideration—the sense of helpless innocence on the part of the recipient. It may not be out of place to compare with the Siestrenczewicz of Count Tolstoi and Catharine the portrait of the Archbishop as he appeared in 1819 to that great upright nobleman of the old school, Joseph De Maistre. Siestrenczewicz was then nearly ninety years of age—he died (1826) at the age of 96:

There is now in Russia a very curious personage, who could belong to no other time and place than the present. It is the Archbishop of Mohilev, Catholic primate of all the Russias, a Protestant and a cavalry officer before being made a Bishop, an instrument in the hands of our enemies a thousand times more dangerous than a professed Protestant, so servile, moreover, as to disgust a noble power which is satisfied with obedience, always ready to contradict and, if need be, to oppose the Holy See, because he is sure of being supported. It is he who once said in court, as the Emperor passed by: "There goes my Pope!" The witnesses of that admirable profession of faith are yet living at St. Petersburg. This strange Bishop undertook one day to falsify a text of the Council of Trent and another text taken from a letter of Pius VI. For this double "fault" (one had to be satisfied with this word) the actually reigning Pope (Pius VII.) could not refrain from writing him a brief in which he blamed him with much severity, and ordered him to make a retraction. But the Bishop of Mohilev, knowing that he was safe, laughed at the brief and made no retraction of any kind. To crown his merits, this prelate has become a member of the Bible Society. . . . A Catholic Bishop as a member of the Bible Society is something so monstrous that it defies expression. The Pope sent to this singular prelate another brief, which he heeded no more than the preceding one; his conduct merited (imperial) approval. That is how a Catholic Bishop is sustained (in Russia) against the Pope. It is the abolition of all order, as though the officers of a regiment were declared free of any subordination to their general. It means the annihilation of Catholicism.²⁰

²⁰ "Lettres et Opuscules," II., 389, Paris, 1861. Père Lescoeur, from whom I translate this page, adds (p. 27): "One must read this whole letter of De Maistre on the condition of Christianity in Europe. All that he says of the Russian Church is literally true to-day, and would of itself be sufficient to illustrate the real and fatal situation of Catholic Poland in the eyes of Russia; the latter refuses to comprehend any other solution for the Polish conscience than a schismatic break with Rome." Lescoeur, "L'Eglise Catholique et le Gouvernement Russe," Paris, 1860, new edition, 1903 (Librairie Plon), a work that only needs an index to be an excellent account of the dealings of the imperial Russian chancery with the Holy See from the first partition of Poland to the year 1875. The author says (p. 1): "On aurait pu le prolonger et le continuer jusqu'à ce jour; car malgré la différence profonde des temps, nombre de justes griefs sont restées les mêmes ou se sont renouvelées. Il en serait bientôt tout autrement si une législation

The first partition of Poland brought to Catharine, among other territories, that of Little Russia, and with it 1,800,000 souls, mostly united Ruthenians belonging to the diocese of Polock, one of the suffragans of Kiew, to which metropolitan church there were subject at the time Lemburg and Przemysl with a part of Chelm. The latter districts had the good fortune to fall to Austria, and as a result there are yet in Austrian Poland some 3,000,000 Ruthenian Catholics, with nearly 400,000 in Hungary. Poland herself for a while held the metropolitan church of Kiew with several suffragan dioceses. However, with an insignificant exception, the remainder of the Ruthenian Catholics fell to Russia in the course of the second and third partitions. This population, more genuinely Slav in blood, habits and speech than any other part of Russia, had been reconciled with Rome by the Union of Brest in 1595, thereby re-knitting old ties of union that dated from the tenth or the eleventh century and had been interrupted only by the malice and hatred of the clergy of Constantinople during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.²¹ The lands of Little Russia had fallen to Poland by conquest in the course of the sixteenth century. In 1720 the famous Synod of Zamoisc (in Lithuania) had regularized their ecclesiastical affairs and relations, though in the years immediately preceding the first partition of the kingdom the metropolitans of Kiew had not been always worthy of their office. Moreover, the

nouvelle venait à se créer plus conforme à l'esprit nouveau." I have drawn largely on it for the documents and for several appreciations in the preceding pages.

²¹ Many important ancient documents concerning the original relations between Rome and the Slavs are found in Theiner, "Vetera Monumenta historiam Poloniæ et Lituanie illustrantia," 2 vols. fol. Rome, 1860; also in Bielowski, "Monumenta Poloniæ Historica," vol. I; cf. Frind, "Kirchengeschichte Boehmens," Prague, 2 vols., 1862-1866. Two admirable works of Tondini resume for the general reader much ancient ecclesiastical history of the Slavs: "La Primauté de S. Pierre prouvée par les titres que lui donne l'Eglise Russe dans sa liturgie," Paris, 1867; "Le Pape de Rome et les papes de l'Eglise Orthodoxe," Paris, 1874; cf. also Dom Guépin, "Saint Josephat Kuncewitch, archevêque de Polock, martyr de l'unité catholique et l'Eglise Grecque unie en Pologne," Paris, 1874. The studies of the Bollandists on the lives of some of the earlier Slav saints illustrate quite fully this point of history, e. g., "Diss. de conversione Russorum," in *Acta Sanctorum* for September (vol. II.). The pages of De Maistre in the "Soirées de St. Peterbourg" on this subject remain always authoritative and convincing. Cf. Lescoeur op. cit., pp. 523-528. Lengenich, "Dissert de religionis christianæ in Polonia initis," Cracow, 1734; Leporowski, "De primis episcopatibus in Polonia conditis," Herbipol, 1874. Bonet-Maury, "Les premiers témoignages de l'introduction du christianisme en Russie" (*Revue de l'histoire des religions*), 1901, p. 223, sq. Palmieri, "La Conversione dei Russi al cristianesimo la testimonianza di Fozio," in *Studi Religiosi*, 1901, p. 153 sq. Veredière, "Origines Catholiques de l'Eglise Russe," in *Etudes de Théologie* (Paris, 1857, II., 133 sq.), and *ibid* Gagarine, II., 75; Hergenroether-Kirsch, "Kirchengeschichte" (ed. 1904), II., 280-286.

Russians, often quartered upon their territory, had made clearly known the fate reserved to the Catholics once they were gathered under the sceptre of "divine" Catharine and her successors.

After the first partition Catharine forbade her Ruthenians all communication with Rome and even with their old metropolitan church of Kiew (being yet a part of Poland). It was only in 1795, however, when the last spark of Polish independence was extinguished that she began her barbarous work of exterminating Roman Catholicism. Here, too, her most useful agent was Siestrenczewicz, "a man who caused more damage to the Catholic Church of both rites in Russia than all the schismatics."²² But her immediate instrument was Stephen Bulgari, a Greek adventurer from Corfu and a one-time friend and courtier of Frederick II., from whose service he had passed to that of Catharine. He proposed the establishment among the Ruthenians of a college of Russian "Popes" under a Greek Bishop. The suggestion was acted upon, the missionary college was richly endowed and Victor Sardowski, archimandrite of Sluck, made its first president. At once throughout the extent of the ancient metropolitan district of Kiew began endless acts of violence, deception and cruelty. All the old Ruthenian sees on Russian territory were suppressed, with the exception of the archiepiscopal see of Polock, the Bishops deposed and banished; with particular hatred it was decreed that Kiew should never more be an episcopal see. Its last metropolitan died at St. Petersburg in 1798, a pensioner of the Czar, two years after the death, in the same place and estate, of the last King of Poland! The former Catholic parishes were converted wholesale by force and by lies, the priests were exiled or abused and their families divided and persecuted. Catharine wrote the Pope that the people were free to choose their own pastors. She did not say that this was done by the village authorities, and that the latter were compelled to act as the Russian Sate dictated to them. All churches that had been built before the union with Rome in 1595 were declared Russian churches, and their populations incorporated with the State church. It was decreed that no new parish could be founded unless it counted one hundred "hearths;" and that all parishes below that number would be considered as integrant parts of the Russian Church. As the villages of these territories are thinly peopled, the result was a general destruction of the Roman Catholic ecclesiastical system. The parishes were broken up, the churches confiscated or abandoned, the priests driven away and often ruined by the confiscation or forced sale of their property. It became impossible for the Ruthenian Catholics to attend their few churches in the winter, by reason of the great distances that separated them. And all this time the heavy hand of Siestrenczewicz was oppressing everywhere through-

²² Fr. Neher in Wetzer and Welte, "Kirchenlexicon," VII., p. 442.

out the land the Basilian Uniat monasteries in the name of a higher secularized education, while the Ruthenian Catholics of his vast diocese were perishing for want of a defender. All this time he was flattering the Empress and defying the Pope and excogitating fresh schemes for enslaving the Latins and compelling the Uniats into the deathly schism they had happily escaped from. Catharine did not live to finish her work; she died in 1796, three years after the treaty of Grodno. Those three years, however, were enough to reduce the number of Ruthenian parishes in the dioceses of Kiew, Luczk, Kamienitz and Wladimir from five thousand to one thousand. She withdrew from the Roman obedience eight millions, and was therefore, since Martin Luther, the most successful enemy of Roman Catholicism; all the more so as with regard to our religion it is her principles, precedents, laws and spirit that have ever since dominated in the land of the Muscovite²³

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Washington, D. C.

²³ The reign of Catharine II. marks the first period and, so to speak, the first act of the long drama of religious oppression which began for Poland on the day of her national downfall, a drama that is being daily unrolled and always, despite the differences of men and times, with the same characteristics above, an unintelligent russophile patriotism, kept alive by the statesmen who make use of "Pravoslav" fanaticism as a means of paralyzing the best intentions of their master, below, an army of subaltern agents, violent men of shameless cunning and often of savage cruelty. . . . The legislation of Catharine II. and her executive measures have remained the finished type and unchangeable model for all attempts at the annihilation of the faith of Catholic Poland. Père Lescoeur, *op. cit.* pp. 13-17.

UNIVERSITY EDUCATION IN IRELAND.

ONE of the things which strikes an observer most in Ireland to-day is the extremely small provision made by its rulers for the higher education of its people. In no other country is its importance more clearly recognized by the population, but in none is there less public effort to provide it. Trinity College is certainly an imposing mass of buildings, and it possesses large property, numerous professors and a considerable body of students, but the latter are almost exclusively drawn from a class limited to an eighth of the population of the country, and the control of studies and revenues is in the hands of a small close corporation drawn from the same class, distinctively hostile to Irish national aspirations and recruiting itself as vacancies occur in its membership by arbitrary coöption. There is no other residential university in the Irish capital. There are several schools of medicine and a college of science, under control of the English commissioners, in South Kensington. There is also a university college, housed in some buildings that were formerly private houses, but otherwise one seeks in vain for institutions of the higher learning in Dublin.

Nevertheless, there is no country in which the need of educational training, intellectual and scientific, is greater than in Ireland to-day. The want is recognized by all classes of the population and admitted time and again by their rulers, but almost nothing has been done during the last forty years to give any practical supply of the want. Mr. Balfour, the present Prime Minister, confesses it to-day, as Gladstone did twenty-seven years ago, but measures to remedy the existing state of things are ever deferred by those in authority. Twenty years ago Sir Lyon Playfair stated the case clearly in the British Parliament. He declared, without reply, that "the competition of nations now was not one of brute force or local advantages, but of intellect, and foreign nations recognize this fact. The nation best educated will be the greatest, if not to-day, surely to-morrow. Before the war with Germany university education had fallen so low in France that the State support given it was less than fifty thousand dollars annually. After that war the French Institute had discussed for two weeks the question why France had shown an intellectual paralysis during its continuance, why no great leaders had appeared in the moment of danger, and the answer given that it was because the higher education of the nation had been grossly neglected. France now (in 1885) spends two and a half millions annually on university

education. Germany has twenty-four universities and spends three million dollars a year on them from the public revenue. Holland, with a population like that of Ireland or Scotland, spends nearly seven hundred thousand dollars annually on its four universities." In the face of these facts, stated by one ranking among the highest educational authorities in England, it is well to examine what provision was then made by the government for the higher education of the four millions of Irish Catholics subject to its rule, and what it has since done for their needs.

The last point can be answered so easily that it may be done at once. During the past twenty years the Administration of Ireland has conceded the salaries of six additional teachers, amounting to about ten thousand dollars annually, to the needs of the Irish Catholics, three and a half millions of people, for modern higher education. The burdens of Irish taxation in the same time have been increased by about ten million dollars for imperial expenditures. The facilities for acquiring higher education in Ireland to-day are practically what they were twenty years ago, and no more.

There are at present two university bodies in Ireland with the legal power of granting degrees. The older of the two, or Dublin University, is so closely connected with Trinity College as practically to depend on its authorities. The college proper is a close corporation, ruled by a board of eight senior fellows and a provost. The senior fellows hold office for life, and vacancies in their ranks are filled by them from a body of thirty junior fellows, who themselves are also selected by the board from the graduates of the college. With the exception of the ecclesiastical seminaries like Maynooth and Clonliffe, Trinity College is the only university institution in Ireland which has buildings and grounds to accommodate resident students, like Oxford, Yale or Harvard. Those of Trinity are on a scale of completeness equal to any of the English or American universities. Over a thousand students can be lodged within its rooms, its library is the largest in Ireland, and its lecture halls and laboratories are on a scale of magnificence unsurpassed in the British Empire. This college and university are directed by members of the Protestant Episcopal Church exclusively.

The value of its buildings and gardens alone are estimated, conservatively, at a value of five million dollars, and the college further owns estates of about two hundred thousand acres, or one per cent. of the whole area of Ireland. Its yearly revenue from this source, independent of students' fees, was until lately reckoned at fifty-five thousand pounds, or nearly three hundred thousand dollars. The senior fellows receive, or did till lately, incomes of ten thousand dollars each, and the provost, thirty thousand, with an extensive

residence. The professors and tutors also receive very large salaries, and numerous scholarships, sizarships and prizes are distributed among the body of students. The latter at present number about a thousand, but they are almost exclusively drawn from the members of a single religious denomination, and it is a denomination which reckons less than an eighth in the population of Ireland. The governing board of senior fellows is exclusively Episcopalian, and it has the legal authority to select all future members. The thirty junior fellows, chosen by the seniors as the body from which their own ranks are to be selected on occasion, is also exclusively Protestant, as are all the professors of the college. One, and only one, nominal Catholic has been elected a junior fellow during the three centuries of the existence of Trinity College without a formal renunciation of his faith. That exception was the late Professor Maguire, who won unpleasant notoriety about ten years ago as one of the principal agents in the plot of the *London Times* to ruin the character of Parnell and other Irish members by the Pigott forgeries. Mr. Maguire, it may be added, was not a native of Ireland.

The circumstances which have given a close corporation of eight individuals control of the only residential university of Ireland and its endowments throw a curious light on the practical value of reforms carried out under the present administration of the British Empire. When Mr. Gladstone disestablished the State Church, thirty years ago, the national funds for university education were looked on as part of its corporate property as well as the tithe charges for public worship. The Prime Minister recognized the injustice of leaving the former under control of a petty denomination, but he seemed incapable of devising any method for restoring them to the use of the general public. He simply transferred Trinity College and its property to the body ruling it at the time, with the sole condition that it should not publicly establish any religious test for admission to its fellowship or professoriate. The existing fellows were left absolute discretion to admit members for the future, and they have since used that discretion to exclude Catholics from any part with their own co-religionists in control of the college or its property. As a natural consequence scarcely any Catholic students can be found to attend its courses, except to a limited extent in the medical department. As far as the higher education goes the Catholics, who form seven-ninths of the Irish population, receive scarcely more profit from Trinity College than they do from the University of Berlin or Vienna.

The second university body existing in Ireland is the Royal University, established by Gladstone's government somewhat over twenty years ago. It has taken the place of another body, known

as the Queens University, which had been in existence with little result for about thirty years previously. The Royal University is only an Examining Board and has no connection directly with any teaching institution. It is governed by a Board of Commissioners named by the British Ministry and has funds of a hundred thousand dollars a year at its control. From this a body of thirty fellows, selected by competitive examination, are paid salaries of two thousand dollars each. Their duties are to conduct yearly examinations in the various university branches and to teach at other times in colleges to which they may be assigned by the Governing Board. Fifteen are so assigned to the Catholic University College in Dublin, the others being employed in the Queens Colleges and elsewhere. The salaries of these fifteen professors are the sole public contribution given to the Catholic population for university education at present. They represent a money value of about twenty-two thousand dollars.

The work of the Royal University is limited to preparing courses of studies for degrees and examining candidates in these courses on a uniform plan. It has charge of professional as well as literary and scientific education and grants degrees in law, medicine and engineering, as it does the ordinary university degrees. It is with the latter we are chiefly concerned in this sketch, as it is by them the modern intellectual development of the different classes of the Irish people can best be traced. The professional schools in Ireland are practically supported by the fees of those attending them. There are several long established medical colleges besides those connected with Trinity College, the Catholic University College and the three Queen's Colleges. The students of all are equally eligible for the degrees of the Royal University. The students for the Church ministry, Catholic or non-Catholic, are a numerous body in Ireland, and of course receive a training of university character, but they have no connection with the Royal University, except as far as individuals among them may seek degrees in its faculty of arts. Trinity College maintains a divinity school for the exclusive benefit of the late Established Church body. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church supports another in Belfast, the majority of its students attending the secular courses of the Belfast Queens College. These two classes furnish about four hundred students, who are reckoned officially among the attendance of the two colleges just named. The Catholic ecclesiastical students are not reckoned as university men in any official statements, though receiving a university training in practice. Between Maynooth, Carlow, Kilkenny, Clonliffe, All Hallows and other seminaries they probably number over a thousand, independent of the students belonging to

the various religious orders, who must be from three to four hundred.

It is needed to keep this point in mind in forming a correct judgment of the numbers of the various classes of the Irish population represented in university education. The Catholic priests trained in Maynooth or Carlow have practically the same literary and scientific training as the Protestant ministers educated in Trinity or the Belfast Queens College, but in official statistics they are never reckoned as university men, while the latter are. This fact tends to give an undue impression of the comparative numbers of the highly educated classes among Irish Catholics and Irish Protestants respectively. How serious the error may be can be reckoned by the Parliamentary constituency of Trinity College, which alone in Ireland has the right of electing members to represent its graduates in the Imperial Parliament. Its electors are those who have received the university degree of master of arts. They number four thousand two hundred, and of those no less than twenty-six hundred are clergymen of the Disestablished Church at the present time.

Apart from the seminaries and professional schools there are at present in Ireland four colleges outside Trinity devoted to the higher education. They are the Queens Colleges of Belfast, Cork and Galway, and the Catholic University College of Dublin. In some other institutions there are small classes or isolated students following a university course, but the four just named are the only ones provided with a full staff of professors for such course in arts and science as laid down by the Royal University. The three Queens Colleges are supported by the public funds and directed by the British Ministry. The Catholic University College was built by private subscription, and with the exception of the salaries of part of its staff is supported entirely by the same and the fees of its students. It is important to compare the value of each of these institutions for the intellectual development of the Irish people, which is amongst their most vital needs to-day.

For the comparison a sketch of the origin of all four is necessary. The three Queen's Colleges were projected by the Ministry of Sir Robert Peel in 1845 as a concession to the demands of the Irish people outside the then Established Church to a share in university education without having to seek it from a distinctly Protestant institution. The members of the Established Church at the time numbered less than one-eighth of the whole Irish population. More than seven millions of Catholics and dissenting Protestants were without any college for the higher studies in Ireland, and the injustice was recognized even in England. It was nearly five years,

however, before the promises of the Ministry developed into tangible shape, and during these five years the population in question had been reduced by nearly a quarter through the dread famine. The Queen's Colleges were finally organized in 1849 and set in operation two years later as "undenominational" university schools, without any religious test for either attendance in their classes or occupancy of their chairs. What "undenominational" means in English official minds may be gathered from the teaching staff provided by the Prime Minister of the day, a distinguished Liberal in profession.

A sum of about two hundred thousand dollars annually was appropriated for teachers and scholarships in the three colleges, and buildings for them erected in Belfast, Cork and Galway at a further cost of about half a million. The Ministry named the heads and twenty professors for each college in the various courses, without other test than the discretion of the Prime Minister. In Cork, the capital of Munster, where ninety-seven per cent. of the population was Catholic, a Catholic, Dr. Kane, was appointed head, but not a single Catholic professor in the faculty of arts. Two in the medical department and one in the legal were the only Catholic professors in this undenominational college for nearly two millions of a Catholic population. In Galway, for the even more Catholic province of Connaught, Lord John Russell named two Catholics among the twenty professors. In Belfast, the college to provide for Ulster's educational needs, the case was even stranger. The majority of the population of the province was Catholic, and of the Protestant minority not much over one-half was Presbyterian. Sir Robert Peel in 1845 communicated to the House of Commons, when discussing his bill to furnish Ireland with a "non-sectarian university," a communication which he had received from "a Presbyterian clergyman of high character," with apparent assent to its requirements. It ran thus:

"Sir John Graham appears to have intimated that all religions would be represented among the professorships. Now I should be acting most unfaithfully to the government did I not clearly express my conviction that *one Roman Catholic* or Unitarian professor in the essential parts of the undergraduate course would at once decide the General Assembly to withdraw every student. You might, indeed, appoint an Episcopalian, not known as a Puseyite, as readily as a Presbyterian or a Baptist, Independent or Methodist, without much dissatisfaction, but not a Unitarian or a Roman Catholic professor."

To appreciate the intolerant insolence of this statement it must be remembered that the Presbyterians in Ulster formed barely a

third of the population whose educational needs were to be provided for from the public funds, apart from the monopoly enjoyed by another section of Protestants already established. Sir Robert did not think it needed to consult the wishes of the Catholic majority in any way on the subject, but gave the Presbyterian General Assembly a "very strong assurance" that their wishes would be complied with. That body in consequence in 1849 graciously passed a resolution endorsing the proposed non-sectarian college in the following terms:

"Whereas, Her Majesty's Government have enabled us to provide for the religious instruction of all our students in the endowment of a theological faculty under our own jurisdiction, and, whereas, the qualifications and character of the persons appointed in the Queen's College of Belfast, for the classes which the students of this Church are required to attend, are such as to justify this Assembly in accepting degrees from that college, we now permit them to attend the classes of that department in the college."

The Presbyterian Assembly has since had no grounds to withdraw its patronage on account of "non-sectarianism." Its head, Dr. Henry, was named president of the college, and during the fifty years since its foundation not a single representative of the Catholic majority in Ulster has been allowed to occupy any chair whatever in its halls. The Catholic population, it need hardly be added, has also remained outside. In 1889 there were just eleven Catholics among a total of four hundred and twenty students. The yearly grant of sixty thousand dollars has, however, been steadily continued for the support of Belfast Queen's College as a distinctively non-sectarian institution.

In the Cork and Galway Colleges there was absolutely no non-Catholic body which could demand to control the nomination of professors, but the English Ministers have spontaneously followed a scarcely less rigorous exclusion of Catholics from their teaching staff, and Catholic students have, almost as consistently, kept aloof from their teaching. As there were scarcely any but Catholics to draw on for students, the colleges themselves have since been almost useless in any educational sense. They receive, nevertheless, an equal share with Belfast from the public funds for professors and scholarships. The latter, in fact, are nearly as numerous as the students enrolled. In 1897 Cork College had a total of thirty-one students attending its courses in arts and Galway fifty-three, though each offered scholarships of an annual value of fifty-six hundred dollars to be divided among this scanty flock. Part of this number, it may be added, is made up of strangers from Ulster, who feel that their Presbyterian scruples are equally free from danger in

the non-sectarian institutions of the Catholic cities as in Belfast itself, even though a rare Catholic may lecture on mathematics or law in the former. Belfast College itself is as completely left to the control of the Presbyterian General Assembly as Trinity College is to its Episcopalian Board of Fellows. Its present president is a Presbyterian minister named, according to the statement of Mr. Balfour, on the request of the Presbyterian clergy.

The Catholic University, or as it is now called, "University College," was founded by the Irish Bishops shortly after the Queen's Colleges had been opened. It was first recommended by the Synod at Thurles in 1850 as an urgent national necessity. Funds to provide the buildings and pay the professors were collected during the next three years, and the university was opened in 1854. During the following twenty-five years annual collections were made through the churches for its maintenance, the total amounting to about an average yearly of forty thousand dollars. The first rector chosen was John Henry Newman, afterwards Cardinal. He consented to devote seven years to the work of its organization, and remained until that term was ended, in 1859. The first teaching staff was mainly selected by him and the courses of studies framed under his direction on the models of Oxford or Cambridge Colleges in general lines.

The quality of instruction offered by Dr. Newman's college was certainly equal to that of the endowed Protestant university, but the number of students drawn to it was limited. The poverty of the Irish Catholics debarred the majority even of its brightest young men from the time and cost needed for a three years' course of studies, with no financial return at the end. The tradition of giving a university education to their children had no existence naturally among the wealthier Irish Catholics who had been debarred from it themselves during so many generations. The new college had no means to offer scholarships or prizes, like those of Trinity or the Queen's Colleges, to students of talent, but without wealth. However, it attracted a much larger number than the two colleges of Cork and Galway, and at least as many as Belfast. Ten years after its foundation it counted three hundred and fifty attendants. About one-half were attendants at evening classes and over a hundred medical students, but about ninety took the full course of arts. It was a beginning not unsatisfactory among a population debarred from higher studies during many generations. The teaching staff was admittedly of the highest character for scholarship. It was drawn largely from the most distinguished men of Oxford and Cambridge, mixed with Irish names like those of W. K. Sullivan, the favorite pupil of Liebig; of Aubrey de Vere

and Denis Florence McCarthy, the translator of Calderon. Pierre Le Page Renouf, described by Lord Acton as "without question the most learned Englishman he had known," was professor of ancient history and Oriental languages. Casey, the greatest mathematician of Ireland; Eugene O'Curry, the first of Celtic archæologists; Ornsby, who was later chosen to direct the education of the Duke of Norfolk; Robertson, the historian, and Sigerson were among the teaching staff of the Catholic University.

It continued its work almost unnoticed for twenty-eight years, during which Trinity College and the Queen's University continued to monopolize the entire of the public funds for higher education. The Queen's Colleges utterly failed to attract Catholic students. They had hardly an average of a dozen such each on their rolls during all these years, and the entire number of Catholics receiving university education in Ireland was hardly a quarter of the students of the Protestant Trinity College. The authorities of the latter professed to see in that fact evidence that their Catholic countrymen were intellectually their own inferiors, and had neither capacity nor desire for serious studies. This theory was highly popular among all classes of Irish Protestants and received credit in England and elsewhere abroad. Some thinking men, however, felt that other causes fully accounted for the small number of Catholic university students in Ireland. The relative poverty of the Catholic population as a whole, a direct result of centuries of proscription, was one. The monopoly of the rewards for learning and the professoriate by the Protestant minority was another, and the limited number of Catholics in the professional classes, whose members everywhere furnish the largest proportion of college students, a third. This last, like the first, was a direct result of the old conditions of the penal laws. In a country like Ireland, where there is little external commerce or change of population, it is a work of more than one generation for a class long held in enforced ignorance to rise to practical equality. It was only at the beginning of the last century that the Irish Catholics were allowed even to open schools, and down to near its close all public foundations remained in possession of the minority. Carlow College and Maynooth were the only public schools of the Irish Catholics at the close of the eighteenth century. Besides Trinity College, the members of the State Church held all endowments for secondary education throughout the country. Their revenues were reckoned at four hundred thousand dollars and furnished so many inducements to Protestants to take up the studies which directly led to their possession. The Catholic majority had to build their schools from their own scanty resources before they could give their children the opportunities for learning

to which the dominant class had been used for eight generations of Protestant ascendancy.

The work of building them was kept up unnoticed for many years. In 1834, five years after Catholic emancipation, there were twenty-three Catholic higher schools, with fourteen hundred pupils, in Ireland. The distinctively Protestant institutions of the same class numbered ninety-six, with forty-two hundred scholars, or just three times the number of Catholic students. The disproportion was terrible, considering that the Catholics formed three-fourths of the Irish population. By 1861 the census showed eighty-six Catholic to sixty Protestant colleges, and an equal number of pupils in each class. The returns of the intermediate examiners, in the closing years of the century, showed the proportions to have changed, so that the number of Catholics receiving secondary instruction was then two to one. It may take some years before it takes the same proportions as the Catholics occupy in the general population, but that result seems sure to come. Whether an equal advance will be made among those receiving university training has yet to be decided. To bring that to pass it seems needed that the existing monopoly of the public funds by non-Catholic institutions be abolished or equal amounts be provided for education of the Catholic section of Irishmen in a manner suited to their wishes.

A measure adopted by the British Ministry in 1879 as an experiment gave remarkable evidence of the work done in education by the Irish Catholics unaided by the State. A body known as the Intermediate Education Board was appointed to examine publicly all pupils of schools above the grade of "national" or primary. It received funds to the amount of twenty thousand pounds yearly to hold such examinations, award prizes and scholarships to a limited number of the best students and publish the results. No distinction was made on the ground of religion; the subjects tested were simply those of secular knowledge. The Protestant endowed schools were admitted to compete equally with the unaided Catholic and private schools. The result was wholly unexpected. The number of pupils receiving a secondary education in 1860 had been only half Catholic. The examinations of the Intermediate Board during the last ten years have shown that twice as many Catholics as non-Catholics passed their tests. The latter, it may be said, in the middle grade are equal to an ordinary university matriculation. Sixty-six hundred in all have passed this test in the last ten years. Forty-three hundred and twenty came from the self-supporting Catholic schools. Of the prizes awarded three hundred and ninety out of a total of little over six hundred also were taken by the Catholics. Of the ten highest in each year eight were from the same body.

The theories of intellectual inferiority of Irish Catholics or inefficient teaching of Catholic schools have since been almost silent.

Three years later, in 1882, the Royal University was established by Mr. Gladstone to extend a like system to the students of university standing through Ireland. It does not teach, but it examines and awards a certain number of scholarships to those most successful in its standards. Students from the endowed Queen's Colleges, from the Catholic University and from any other institutions were called to compete on their own merits. The first examination placed the latter at a marked disadvantage in the standing of its students apart from numbers. Its courses had to be suddenly changed to suit the programme of the Royal University, which itself was modeled on that already in use in the Queen's Colleges. For this reason only three candidates for the third year or "bachelor's degree" were sent in by the Catholic college against forty-five furnished by its rivals. The total number of candidates from the Queen's Colleges who passed the Royal examinations was a hundred and ninety-seven, against eighty from the Catholic college. In the list of honors, however, the students of the latter showed an unlooked for superiority. Belfast College, with a hundred and forty students, gained one hundred and five distinctions; Cork's non-sectarian institution, with twenty-eight students, won twenty honors, and Galway's, with thirty, only eight distinctions. The eighty Catholic University students captured ninety distinctions, and further, in the subjects of classics and modern languages they won fifty-four honors, leaving only forty-eight to the two hundred Presbyterian and non-sectarian colleges.

This remarkable showing was followed by increased success in the following years. The Catholic College in 1896 had doubled its attendance, while its highly endowed competitors had scarcely maintained the numbers of their first year. The arts course of Belfast was only able to recruit a hundred and twenty-two students after ten years, Galway had fifty-three and Cork thirty-one. Catholic University College had over a hundred and sixty. It is remarkable, too, that it had drawn a much higher percentage of non-Catholic students than the non-sectarian colleges had Catholics. Cork had only six of the latter, Galway eighteen and Belfast five, while the Catholic College had nineteen Protestant students on its rolls. The Queen's Colleges had the advantage of a hundred and five scholarships of an annual value of about twenty thousand dollars for division exclusively among their own students. In Cork the scholarships were actually more numerous than the students invited to win them, and only four of the thirty were unprovided with them. It is suggestive of the sincerity of the

opposition of the great body of the Irish population to the non-sectarian teaching offered them by their rulers that among the two hundred and six students of the Queen's Colleges there were only twenty-nine Catholics. The unendowed Catholic College had nearly six times that number on its rolls, of whom a hundred and forty-four were Catholics. If the total seems small for the general population, the poverty of that population must be borne in mind.

It would be too long to trace the numbers of students in the various colleges year by year, and it seems as though those given were substantially an average of the last ten years. The Catholic University attracts five-sixths of the Irish Catholic students who seek university education and also a larger percentage of non-Catholics than the Queen's Colleges do of Catholics. The teaching staff of the latter is predominantly non-Catholic. Catholic teachers are absolutely excluded from Belfast College, and are only employed to the amount of a tenth in the two non-sectarian colleges of Cork and Galway. The relative numbers of the students in the Catholic institution and the three non-sectarian colleges is about as four to five. It is interesting to see how the two bodies compare in educational efficiency under these conditions.

From the returns of the Royal University during the ten years ending with 1903 it appears that sixteen hundred and fifty distinctions of all kinds were won by the four colleges. Of these Cork gained sixty-five, Galway two hundred and fifty, Belfast six hundred and thirty and the Catholic University seven hundred and four. Those distinctions are of two grades of merit, known as first and second. Of the first or highest three hundred and forty-eight were divided by the three State institutions and three hundred and seventy-four taken by the Catholic College. Among the first class distinctions a special class is given to the bachelor scholarships, the studentships for masters of arts and what are known as first class honors, prizes for exceptionally high answering at the second and first year examinations. Of these in all twenty-two were awarded during ten years. Fifteen were taken by Catholic University students and seven by the three non-sectarian colleges. The latter combined also won twenty-nine scholarships and thirteen studentships. University College, with four-fifths of the number of their students, took thirty of the former and fourteen of the latter. Two special studentships in biological science were offered during the ten years and both were taken by Catholic students. They also carried off six of the eight special gold medals offered for English prose and Latin verse. It may be added that this year's examinations show four studentships awarded, the subjects being classics, mathematics, experimental science and mental and

moral science. All four were won by students of the Catholic University College.

Another remarkable fact bearing on the intellectual capacity of the students from Catholic and non-Catholic schools, respectively, has been brought by the published statements of the intermediate schools and Royal University combined. Of the senior grade students examined by the former during the last ten years a certain number, the highest in merit, were awarded "exhibitions" enabling them to support themselves, at least partially, through college for another year. The lists are published of those who won those exhibitions during the ten years ending 1898. The total number was a hundred and seventy-four, about a hundred coming from Catholic schools. Of the total a hundred entered Trinity College, Queen's Colleges or the Catholic University. Thirty-two joined the first, twenty-six entered the Presbyterian College in Belfast, nine—and only nine—the two so-called non-sectarian colleges in Cork and Galway and thirty-three the Catholic University. The calendar of Trinity College for the first year of this century shows that the intermediate exhibitioners who entered there were beyond comparison the best of its students. They won in competition that year nine of ten among the college studentships, sizarships and prizes offered. The prizes of this kind offered by Trinity were, of course, strictly confined to its own pupils, and the winners had not to compete for them with Catholic rivals. It is, however, a striking fact that the standard reached at the intermediate examinations by the students who selected Trinity and won its prizes was notably lower than that of the thirty-three who selected the Catholic University. The percentage of marks awarded by the Intermediate Board to the exhibitioners who afterwards enrolled in Trinity was slightly under an average of thirty-three hundred. The thirty-five who entered Queen's Colleges had thirty-five hundred and fifty, while the thirty-three for the Catholic University had won an average of thirty-nine hundred and forty marks. Their examination standard was twenty per cent. above that of the absolutely best students of the Protestant university.

These results speak their own story as far as the intellectual capacity of the Irish Catholics and the efficiency in a scholastic of the Catholic schools are concerned. They bring out further remarkable testimony of the determination of the Irish Catholics to seek education only under Catholic influences. Of those who entered Trinity and won its prizes only one professed himself a Catholic, of those to Belfast none and to Cork two. Nevertheless, Cork, Belfast and Galway each offered thirty-seven scholarships of greater amount than those already won from the intermediate to

exhibitioners who would accept their teaching. Trinity practically offered still larger inducements materially for matriculation there, but neither attracted Catholics of education and talent. Of the seventy-four intermediate exhibitioners of Protestant denominations not less than sixty joined Trinity and the Queen's Colleges and received from these institutions ample scholarships to support them through a whole university course. The thirty-three who chose the Catholic University elected to make their own way through it unaided, and only five Catholics were willing to enter the rival colleges. Of the other seventy-four exhibitioners, equal in capacity to those who matriculated in the five institutions just named, there would seem to be no less than sixty Catholics. Of the total seventy-four, thirty-five matriculated in the Royal University to follow its courses either by private study or as post-graduates in various colleges or seminaries. Thirty-nine made no attempt to follow university studies, at least not in Ireland. Much the larger number of both these classes were Catholics. Their capacity for university work was equal at least to that of the prizemen of Trinity, but poverty largely debarred them from pursuing it. The choice offered them was between un-Catholic universities or none, and the great majority chose the latter. The spirit which sways the bulk of Irish Catholics to-day in the matter of education seems precisely the same as made their grandfathers accept political disfranchisement rather than the Established Church. The policy of government that refuses them equality in educational funds is exactly the same as that which refused them a share in Parliamentary representation seventy-five years ago.

It is a dreary and ungracious task to have to dwell upon the grievances of a people and point out how illusory are the professions of liberality and boasts of progress made by its rulers, but it is a task that must be performed for the interests of truth. Public education in Ireland to-day is wholly inadequate to the needs of its people, and the cause lies almost wholly in its rulers. It is not in any indifference to its value on the part of the Irish Catholics, to any lack of capacity for it among them or to the inefficiency of Catholic schools and teachers. It is simply that the bulk of the public funds for the higher education are still reserved, almost as fully as during the penal code, for classes numbering little over a fourth of the population of Ireland. The monopoly was once with the single body of State Protestants, numbering an eighth of the whole. The funds enjoyed by it under that monopoly have been left to its members, but they have been supplemented by two other State endowed institutions equally distasteful to the bulk of the Irish people. The Presbyterian body, a tenth of the population,

has been provided with a college, amply endowed, from whose chairs Catholics are rigorously excluded. The political agnosticism now fashionable in England is given sway in two other colleges, where the immense majority of the teachers are chosen from every class, but those belonging to the faith of the Irish people. The solitary Catholic University receives no help except part salaries of fifteen professors. The Catholics in Ireland are to the non-Catholics as seven to two. The State grants them twenty-two thousand dollars annually for the higher education. It spends two hundred thousand on colleges of its own, two of which stand nearly empty, and it secures a single denominational body property worth ten million dollars for the benefit of its members.

There is, however, some ground for hope, even in the existing conditions, for the Irish Catholics. The progress made in the number and efficiency of their intermediate schools and colleges since emancipation is remarkable, considering the disadvantages of the Catholics in material resources. They then had scarcely a third of the number of such institutions monopolized by the Protestant minority. To-day they have double the number of the latter, and the efficiency of the Catholics is at least equal to that of their endowed rivals.

In university institutions, though the number of students is still wholly out of proportion to the Catholic element in the general population, the Catholic University has won for itself a name for scholarship equal if not distinctively superior to Trinity or Belfast. Its students in arts are more numerous than those of Belfast, more than double those of the State colleges at Cork and Galway and superior to either and to Trinity in the tests of practical studies. A result may fairly be looked for like that already gained in intermediate education. It will certainly come if the existing State monopoly in the Queen's Colleges and the Episcopalian monopoly of Trinity be abolished and their funds applied as fully to national use as those of the existing Intermediate Board.

It is especially satisfactory to note the comparatively large proportion of non-Catholic students attracted already by the Catholic University. The percentage is about half that of Catholics and Protestants in the whole population. In Belfast the percentage of Catholic art students is three per cent., though Catholics are fifty per cent. of the population of the province. In the Catholic University non-Catholic students are twelve per cent. of the whole, while they form only twenty-six per cent. of the whole Irish population. The contrast is indeed suggestive.

One of the most encouraging facts at the present time for the future of Catholic education in Ireland is the formation of a dis-

tinctive body of Catholic University graduates during the last twenty years. They are naturally not as numerous as those of Trinity, but they are either their equals or superiors intellectually, and they stand as representatives for three-fourths of the Irish people. The University College, though its buildings are owned by the Bishops as a corporation, is practically self-governing. It is not clerical in any professional sense. Its president is a Jesuit and some members of that order are among its professors, but its governing council is elected triennially from the whole body of professors, all of whom have been elected from graduates of the college. There are fifteen professors and six tutors or assistants. Five of them are priests, the rest laymen, and one or two non-Catholics. The governing council consists of six, five of whom at present are laymen and one a Protestant. The object sought by Irish Catholics is not proscription nor ascendancy. They demand simply that the public funds shall be shared equally between Catholic and non-Catholic teaching institutions on their educational merits. For the organization of their own universities they insist that they shall be ruled by academical bodies representative of Catholic public opinion and their teaching shall be such as the Church finds no reason to condemn. The independence in internal administration of the college they desire to be such as that enjoyed by the colleges of Oxford, Cambridge or Berlin, or the Catholic Universities of Belgium or Austria. The nucleus for such a university already exists in the Dublin University College.

BRYAN J. CLINCH.

San Francisco, Calif

THE ROYAL LINE OF SAVOY: THE PRINCE OF PIEDMONT.

THE names Humbert, Amadeus, Charles, Emanuel, Victor are the frequently recurring stepping stones which span a stream nearly a thousand years wide in the valley of European history.

Although the beginning of the house of Savoy as a ruling power is pretty clearly settled, its antecedent history can no more be traced to its real source than can the innumerable streams that rush down upon Savoy from the broad bosoms of the Alps that shelter and beautify it. Count Humbert of Maurienne is generally regarded as the founder of the present line. He was a stepson of Rudolph III., the Frankish monarch of Arles. Previous to his

time, however, there had been governors of Savoy taken from the house of the Counts of St. Maurice, and the name of one of these, Beroald, would suggest not a Roman but a Teutonic origin. Various tribes had successively dominated the valleys after and before the break-up of the Roman Empire—the Allobroges, Nantuates and others. Humbert, too, is a name suggestive of Teutonic origin, as is Rudolph, the King who first raised Savoy to the countship rank. These facts point to a German source for a line that was to endure for centuries, like the Hohenzollerns and the Hapsburgs and the royal line of Bavaria, the Wittelsbachs. There is no distinctive family name in the Savoy dynasty, like these and several others.

It is a remarkable fact that it was in the bracing air of the Alps was found the inspiration of power and the genius to rule with success. Soldiers, statesmen and patriots of the first degree have opened their eyes in infancy on the towering peaks and verdant vales of the great mountain region—warriors like Henry of Navarre and patriots like Tell and Hofer. In this charmed air there seems to be a quality that links the spirit of command with the genius of liberty in a subtle combination, tempering valor with wisdom and suavity, so that under whatever vicissitudes of fortune perpetuity of leadership among men is assured to the pre-eminent gens by reason of intrinsic excellence as well as by claim of ancient heredity.

The royal house of Italy differs from other royal houses in regard to the title of the heir to the dignity. In England the eldest born is always the Prince of Wales; in France he is the Dauphin d'Auvergne; in Spain the Prince of the Asturias. It is a custom which long usage has solidified into the consistency of a law. But in the Italian house the case is the reverse. The King is the whole College of Heralds in himself; he chooses the titles, rights and prerogatives of all members of the royal line. All that is of settled precedent is that the rank of the heir is that of royal highness. The present King was, ere he acceded to the throne, the Prince of Naples; his father, Humbert, was, in his day, Prince of Piedmont. Political considerations have from time immemorial influenced the selection of the heir-apparent's title in the Savoy family. There is no other family, probably, that possesses so large and picturesque an assortment of titles from which to make a choice; and the motley gathering, like an array of ancient panoply in a feudal gallery, has an independent and romantic history for each separate weapon and suit of war harness. Some of these titles stretch back into the twilight of history—the dukedom of Spoleto, for instance, which dates back to the year 570 A. D., and had a Longobard origin. This title was bestowed upon the Aosta branch

of the royal house, as well as that of the dukedom of Apulia, which dates from the time of the Norman knight-errant, Robert Guiscard (A. D. 1048), and was bestowed by the Pope for services rendered in driving the Saracens from the south of Italy. The dukedom became a kingdom eighty years later, by reason of the success of Robert's descendants in clearing Sicily of the Saracen invaders, who had settled down there as though intent on a permanent occupation and rule. Turin, as capital of the realm for a long period, gave a title to many counts and dukes of the family. Piedmont, or at least a large portion of it, had come into the possession of the Savoy family through marriage as early as the beginning of the eleventh century. This territory became, a century later, a county of the German Empire, and Amadeus III. its vassal, with the title of Count of Savoy. Nice and Coni were successively annexed by his successors, the fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh and eighth Amadeus; and in 1434, under the latter, Savoy was raised to ducal rank. The Marquisates of Susa and Saluzzo were likewise honors acquired by the flourishing house, either through marriage or conquest; as also the viscountship of Chambery, as well as the barony of Vaud and Faucigny, in France. There are innumerable other titles at the disposal of the head of the house of Savoy—nearly all acquired through successful marriages into other houses and the falling in of the territories and the titles into the main branch on the failure of the various indirect lines. The head of the house is also the titular King of Cyprus and Jerusalem and the Armenians. His right to the Spanish succession, by marriage, was recognized by the Cortes when it called the Duke of Aosta to the throne in 1871.

Although for the most part a peaceful race, there were many stout warriors among the Savoy princes. Of these the most celebrated were Amadeus V., who drove the Turks from Rhodes and was called the Great; Emanuel Philibert, who commanded the Spanish army at the battle of St. Quentin (1557), and Victor Amadeus II. The latter was enabled to recover all the family territory which a couple of unlucky predecessors had lost in war, and to gain besides part of the duchy of Milan and the whole of the Kingdom of Sicily. This latter he eventually exchanged for the Island of Sardinia, of which he became King. This was the first actual entry of the Savoy line into the domain of the royalties. It took place in the year 1720. Piedmont and Sardinia were united under the one crown until 1860, when the revolutionary movement in Italy enabled Victor Emmanuel, son of Charles Albert, to assume the title of King of Italy. This was the consummation of a dream for the realization of which his father had vainly struggled. That unfortunate monarch, urged on by the reckless Italian enthusiasts,

had been foolishly driven to war with Austria, and was disastrously defeated at the battle of Novara, in 1848. From this blow he never recovered. It remained for his son, Victor Emmanuel, to avenge the disaster by coöperating with France to drive the Austrians from the Quadrilateral.

It was the hope of the extremists in the Italian peninsula that the new heir to the throne would have bestowed on him a title that was never before borne by a Savoyard—namely, Prince of Rome. But the royal parents had the good sense and good taste to refuse to gratify this spiteful desire. Titles signifying sovereignty over Rome on the part of secular bearers are of evil portent. They are mere iridescent bubbles—a moment bright then gone forever—to vary slightly Burns' fine metaphor.

It was in Piedmont, at Racconigi, below Turin, that the Prince was born. This was in accordance with his parents' wish and the hope of the Piedmontese that a family tradition, though not an invariable one, might be respected.

Though the name Humbert is a favorite one in the family, because it was that of its founder, Amadeus is hardly less beloved, because it was that of his firstborn, and the most distinguished warriors and statesmen of the house have borne it. It was the name, also, of that luxurious member of the stock who was chosen by the minority of the Council of Basle to oppose Pope Eugene IV., whom they had formally pretended to depose as a heretic. Amadeus (he was the eighth of the name) on accepting the worthless nomination, took the name of Felix V. He was chosen, significantly enough, at a period when a pestilence was raging in the place where the unlawful council was holding its sessions; and he himself proved more or less of a pestilence to the Church, since there was no peace in it until he renounced the crown so illegitimately assumed. This he finally did, after a stormy nine years' pretense of rule, from 1439 to 1449. Amadeus had never received holy orders, and never made any pretense at living a sanctified life. He had made a marriage which brought additional territory to the already ample domain of Savoy; and his court was kept in a style of regal magnificence. On the death of his wife he abandoned the direction of affairs into the hands of his son and retired into the monastery of Ripaille. There he is said to have continued to indulge his luxurious Sybarite tastes so lavishly as to attract the attention of the surrounding country, until to live *à la Ripaille* became in the popular mouth a satirical synonym. It was thus he was living in retirement from the world when he was invited to assume the Papal dignity. His election was generally received with derision; only a few princes and bishops regarded it seriously, while the real Pope, Eugene, was on

the other hand supported by France, Italy, England, Spain and Hungary. Nevertheless, Felix continued to act as though he were the rightful Pontiff until Eugene died. The Cardinals in Rome having thereupon elected Thomas de Sarzana (Nicholas V.), Amadeus, or Felix, saw it was useless any longer to pretend to an unreal authority, and resigned the crown in Nicholas' favor. He was allowed to do so, however, on very easy terms, being appointed perpetual Legate in his late temporal dominions and given other extraordinary privileges in recognition of his high rank as a Pontiff, though an irregularly appointed one. So ended this visitation of moral plague to the Church for that particular period. Others were to follow in a short time, with results much more disastrous to the peace of Christendom.

Fortunate as the house of Savoy had been, for the most part, in acquiring new lands and honors, it was not until the reign of Victor Amadeus II. that it reached its apex of success. The long reign of this prince was full of adventurous enterprise. Not only was he enabled to retrieve a good deal of what had been lost by less aggressive predecessors, but he succeeded at length in achieving the summit of the house's ambition, the royal dignity. First he became King of Naples, but Sardinia lying nearer to Savoy, he exchanged his Neapolitan title for that of monarch of Sardinia, and the bargain was ratified by the signatories to the Treaty of London (1720). It was fortunate for the house of Savoy that the exchange was made; for later on the grasping French came on the scene, in the name of liberty, the royal family were driven from Piedmont, and among the people of Sardinia, whose affections the dynasty had gained by a wise and beneficent system of administration, they found not only shelter but valiant defenders. The French navy appeared on the coast in 1793; it bombarded Cagliari and attempted a landing at several other places, but the inhabitants everywhere resisted these efforts so obstinately that the spoilers were forced to relinquish their intended prey. Sixty years later the positions were reversed. The foemen of the earlier time became allies and drove the Austrians from the North of Italy; and the final outcome of these operations was the transfer to France of the ancient heritage of Savoy, in exchange for the duchies of Parma and Modena and the Kingdom of Sicily. Family pride should have forbidden the alienation of the country associated with the ties of nine hundred years. But sentiment must yield to policy in the dealings of the great; even religion has not infrequently had to give way to the material considerations of royal alliances.

Sardinia owes much to the house of Savoy. Previous to its coming under the sway of that wise and capable dynasty it was in a

lamentable condition of neglect and unproductiveness. For four centuries anterior to their advent it had languished under the blighting influence of Aragonese rule. There was no sympathy between the people of the island and its governors. The former were Italian, if not by blood, at least in language, to a large extent, and in spirit and temperament. The same motley admixture of blood is found in the chief islands of the Mediterranean—Corsica, Sardinia, Sicily—yet the populations of each seem to have been more affected by Italian influences than either French or Spanish. Hence the rulers from Piedmont and Savoy never experienced the resistance that the French did in Corsica; in fact, they were from the beginning welcomed as friends; and there never was any insurrection against their authority there, while in Corsica the hostility of a large part of the mountain population toward the French lasted down to the advent of Bonaparte as ruler of France.

Owing to the isolated position of Sardinia, the outside world really knew little or nothing about the island, in the past or the present, until the fortunes of war brought it into connection with Piedmont and the house of Savoy—a connection which has ever since been uninterrupted. When the union was affected, the long silence was broken and the light of inquiry began to reveal the many interesting things that had lain so long hidden under the mists of neglect and forgetfulness. All the large islands in the Mediterranean are teeming with interest, of many kinds, historical, ethnological, poetical and legendary. Sardinia is fully as rich in all these as any of the others—perhaps more so. These things were practically unknown to Europe until the advent of the Savoy princes. These brought progress, and they bade learning to rise and open the page of history and find what Sardinia was in the past and what she might aspire to be in the future. The first authority to call attention to its claims was the Cavaliere Giuseppe Manno, a scholar, a man of affairs and a keen wit, who was one of the Supreme Board of Sardinia which controlled its administration and watched over its interests in Turin after the incorporation of the kingdom with the duchy. The writer's position gave him access to the archives, both in the island and on the mainland; and these he utilized in the best way to the unfolding of a record full of varied interest to the historian and the statesman. His work was published in Turin in the year 1827, and was followed in 1831 by another giving fine views of Sardinian urban and rural life and the antiquities of the hitherto unknown island. From *Sardo*, the leader of a Libyan colony in remote pre-Christian days, the present name of the island is derived. Before his coming it was called *Ichnusa*. Strabo and Ptolemy, Pliny and Pomponius Mela men-

tion it as having been early colonized by Etruscans. In the palmy days of Carthage it was a dependency of that power. Afterwards it became a Roman colony. Christianity was introduced in the early part of the fourth century, when a Bishop of Cagliari is spoken of. But then came the Vandals, and with them persecution and martyrdom for the Christians for a long period, until the Emperor Justinian sent a Byzantine force to conquer the island and bring it peace. After several centuries of quiet, troubles again came with successive invasions of Longobards, Moors and Saracens. The latter got the upper hand after long conflicts, and retained their supremacy until the early part of the eleventh century. Then the Genoese and the Pisans, combining against the African enemy, swooped down and drove the garrisons out and divided the island between themselves and some Spanish and other adventurers who had thrown in their lot with them for the recovery of the island from the infidel. After the partition they quarreled among themselves, and there was another period of chaos, until the trouble was for the time settled by the division of the island into four jurisdictions, under rulers who were styled Judges. In the thirteenth century the Aragonese appeared on the Sardinian stage as supporters of the Judge of Arborea against the aggression of the Genoese and the Pisans, and stubbornly stuck to their footing until they had succeeded in reducing the whole island to a dependency of Spain, under the rule of a viceroy. This rule was, as all rule unbeloved of the ruled must be, fatal to national prosperity. Sardinia withered and sank into a condition of anæmia. Her population gradually dwindled, lawlessness reigned and the civic life of the country fell into a state of catalepsy. Such was the condition of affairs when the island was given into the care of the house of Savoy by the Treaty of London in the year 1720.

Here it is permissible to pause and consider the what had been and weigh it with the what might have been under other conditions. The means of making such an estimate are abundant. If Sardinia did languish under the soporific spell of Spanish rule, let us ask ourselves how she might have fared had she continued under the sway of either the Genoese or the Pisans. We have only to consider the fate of the various republics on the Italian mainland, to find a dismal answer to the inquiry. If the rule of the Spanish Viceroys was enervating, the fact was due to the indifference of the people themselves. Spanish rule gave them a representative government, in the shape of an elective assembly, called the *Stamenti*, in which the three orders—the nobility, the clergy and the people of the towns—were proportionately represented. Yet so little interest did the people at large take in their national par-

liament that it became in process of time little more than a cypher; the laws it enacted met with little or no respect; the system of legal redress for wrongs fell into desuetude; the musket or the stiletto was substituted for the court decree; whole districts, especially in the mountainous region, had shaken off all form of adherence to law, refusing to pay taxes or submit to any control; brigandage prevailed in many places, crime went unpunished, and save in the larger towns, a state of chaos and anarchy existed generally in Sardinia. Under this disastrous condition of things commerce languished and the population dwindled in proportionate ratio. The militia of the island, which in 1588 mustered 30,000 foot and 7,000 cavalry, had declined to 20,000 foot, though the cavalry had increased to 9,000. In 1814, after ninety years of the Savoy rule the militia had increased to 35,000 cavalry and 25,000 infantry—a very respectable army for an island of Sardinia's dimensions.

A surprising change came over the country under the rule of the first King, and the improvement thus begun was maintained and brought to a culmination under the reign of Charles Emmanuel III., who earned the appellation of "the Great," for his own wisdom and enlightenment as well as for the able ministers whom he gathered about him, especially his Prime Minister, Count Bogino, whose name is still venerated both in Piedmont and Sardinia. A sound system of administration was organized, upright magistrates were appointed, the law once more made itself feared and respected, criminals were duly punished and the depredations of the banditti checked. The King devoted much attention to the improvement of agriculture, of flocks and herds and the cultivation of the mulberry tree, which grows abundantly throughout Sardinia; commerce again filled the ports and marts; colleges and schools were set up; two universities were established, one at Cagliari and another at Sassari, and many fine works were issued from the printing presses in these now flourishing centres. This impetus continued down to the end of Charles Emmanuel's reign (1773) and even beyond that period, until it received a temporary check through the descent of the French upon the Italian peninsula and the aggression of their fleets in Italian waters. This aggression aroused the indignation of the islanders, and every attempt that the invaders made to obtain a footing on the coast was resisted with such desperate energy that the insolent foe was at last forced to abandon the project of an invasion of Sardinian territory.

The French were more successful in their aggression upon Piedmont. The royal family were forced to fly from the capital, Turin, and take refuge in Sardinia. Here they were received with affec-

tionate welcome, and the King, Charles Felix, and his successor, Victor Emmanuel I., devoted all their energies to the development of the island. The latter initiated measures which soon proved to be of vast benefit to the place. There had been immense tracts of land lying waste—common lands, as they were called—and these he caused to be enclosed and placed under proper cultivation. Soon these hitherto useless wilds were converted into thriving and blooming fields and gardens, and the owners of the large estates, taking the hint, began the introduction of improved agricultural methods, until all the island felt the benefit of the new impulse. Thus Piedmont's distress proved the crowning of Sardinia's resurrection; and from that period forward the country has made substantial progress. During the reign of Charles Felix schools were, by his decree, provided in every commune or parish where none had previously existed. All these schools were free. In them, besides the three R's, there were also taught religion, the catechism and elementary agriculture. This was as far back as the year 1820. So that Sardinia may be regarded as having been among the pioneers of the movement for a more enlightened system of modern education.

The literature and laws of Sardinia form a deeply interesting subject of study. The laws were the product of various eras and different systems of government, for as we have seen, the island had suffered many vicissitudes. Greek and Saracen had been its masters, at different periods; Roman and Carthaginian had drenched its soil with blood, during several centuries of war; the Vandal had trampled its harvests and abused its people; the Moor had swayed its destinies later on, for many more centuries, and finally the Spaniard had lorded it in Sardinia until compelled to loosen his grip by the treaty of London. These fluctuations of fortune were conducive neither to the growth of a distinctive literature, a distinctive people nor a distinctive judicial code. Yet, strangely enough, the physical characteristics of the people of this mixed blood are distinctive. The Sardinian is a good type of Southern Caucasian. His Grecian blood gives him his regular features; his Moorish strain his swarthy complexion. They are quick-tempered, like most Southern peoples, but they have virtues which counterbalance to a large extent, their flaws of character. They are honest and moral. They may kill a man for jealousy or to avenge family honor, but they will not rob or cheat. That is, the ordinary run of the population; there were banditti in the old times who lived by robbery and murder, but these gentry have long ago disappeared.

Down to the eighteenth century but little progress had been made in literature in the island, but since the advent of the house

of Savoy there has been a pleasing change in that respect. Possibly the history of the Cavaliere Manino was the most important work the island had produced down to his day. Fiction might naturally be expected to be prolific in a country so picturesque as Sardinia, and so full of materials for the production of romance. Yet nothing of importance had been evolved in that sphere down to the beginning of the nineteenth century. Then an author of the first rank suddenly appeared on the scene—one who was by many critics esteemed fit to rank with Manzoni. Like Sir Walter Scott he preserved an incognito until he felt his fame assured. Then he was discovered to the world as Signor Varese. His best works were "Il Proscritto," "Falchotto Malaspina" and "Preziosa di Santuri"—all three being romances dealing with mediæval life in Sardinia. They were remarkable for their dramatic power both in construction and technique, and soon achieved a world-wide celebrity. To the outside world they were especially valuable, as the only source of light upon the early life of Sardinia down to that time available. The glimpses thus revealed disclose a people semi-civilized, or rather half barbarous, steeped in savage superstitions and presenting many features of resemblance to the Highland clansmen of Scotland, in their feuds, their passionate tribal attachments and their strange mingling of intense piety and childlike beliefs in witchcraft and the powers of evil. Some of the scenes depicted in "Preziosa" remind one very forcibly of certain weird chapters in "Rob Roy" and cantos in "The Lady of the Lake."

In mediæval Sardinia, as elsewhere, the practice of appeal to the ordeal for the settlement of legal causes was a recognized resort of litigants. Some English critics seemed to think that such a custom afforded proofs of a condition of barbarity rather than civilization, but they overlooked the fact that it prevailed in England itself down to a period far beyond the middle ages. In the sixteenth century, for instance, two Irish chieftains, who were rival claimants to certain lands, were allowed to decide their controversy by arms. The combat took place in the presence of judges of the law courts, and was fought in the court-yard of Dublin Castle. It is sought to cast a slur on the Church, too, by these hypercritical commentators because the ordeal was always begun by a religious service, each disputant appealing to the judgment of God as to the righteousness of his claim. It is only necessary to say that the civil law everywhere provided the forms of legal process and the methods in which appeals and penalties were carried out, and the only part that the Church had in such tragical scenes was that of affording spiritual consolation to the victims of the law or their opponents' superiority in arms.

The ordeal was of various kinds. There was the ordeal by water, for instance, open to one condemned to be burnt, as a means of proving innocence in cases of witchcraft; and there was the ordeal of touching the dead in cases of murder. These ancient customs are utilized with powerful effect in the pages of Varese. Many of his scenes are more thrilling in their tragic romance than the story of Verdi's troubador and his gipsy mother. One of his scenes in "Preziosa" depicts an ordeal by battle, interrupted and terminated by the interposition of a holy hermit like Telemachus, who brings with him a venerable reliquary and places himself between the combatants, daring them to profane the sacred object by the effusion of blood. In another scene, the heroine, Preziosa, saves herself from the stake by accepting the ordeal by water. She springs from a high cliff into the sea, and is rescued from death by her lover, who had hidden a boat near the scene of the trial.

The vendetta, or blood heritage, existed in Sardinia in much the same way as it did in Corsica. The mode in which the obligation was handed down is most graphically described in the pages of "Preziosa." In a revolt against the Aragonese one of the Viceroy's soldiers shoots the son and heir of the Capo-tribu of Genasgento, and there being no brother, the duty of vengeance falls on a sister, a little girl of ten. The body of the slain youth is laid out in state, his disconsolate father sitting beside it, and some women of the tribe, mourners of a professional kind like those who were known as "keeners" in Ireland, set up a chant in praise of the dead and grief for his taking off. This is, again, like the "coronach," or "lament" described in "Rob Roy." In the midst of this dismal plaint the young girl, Nura, the sister, who is dressed in her richest costume, but with hair hanging loose, approaches the bier, escorted by three of her kinsmen. She is made to dip her handkerchief in the blood of the deceased. Then, after the funeral is over, she is led to the house where her father has closed himself in, and throwing the gory handkerchief into his lap, she demands that he take up the task of vengeance which has devolved upon her, but which she is unfit, being a girl, to execute. Then one of the girl's cousins begins the task of reciting the usual formula, the girl, having fainted and invoked "the malediction of heaven upon his hoary head if he failed to bring down the assassin of his son;" and to this dreadful imprecation the old man has to respond "amen."

The savage notions of this period are exemplified in the existence as a separate class in Sardina, to which those professional dirge-singers belonged. This class was known as the *accabaduri*—a word derived from another Italian verb signifying "to knock on the head." The men of this class were hired for purposes of murder,

just as the Venetian bravoës used to be; and the women earned something by their attendance at funerals. As it was well known that such was their avocation, the *accabaduri* were shunned as a criminal class; and yet the law was not strong enough either to suppress them or to punish those who hired them to commit outrage and murder.

The funeral customs of these island mountaineers suggest a remote connection between the East and the West. They resemble in some respects the rites attributed to the ancient Egyptians and also to the Greeks. For instance, the idea that the manes of the murdered must be propitiated by the punishment of the murderer; likewise the sacrifice of the dead man's dog at his grave, to be deposited at his feet in death, and the burial of the martial equipment of the deceased along with the body.

The hypothesis of a racial tie between the people of Sardinia and the Irish and Scottish Celts, at some period in the prehistoric past, is greatly strengthened by the existence of architectural remains of unknown origin. There are round towers in Sardinia, as there are in Ireland, and they are of similar design, but of wider dimensions. In both cases the door and staircase in these edifices were placed at a good height from the ground, so as to place the occupants out of the reach of marauders. No reliable light whatever has been shed on the origin and practical purposes of these enigmatical structures, in either case; and it is highly probable that they may remain a mystery, as to these points, until the end of time.

In the evolution of Sardinian civilization from such a semi-savage condition it was, perhaps, fortunate for the people that their lot was cast on an island rather than on the Italian mainland. Over the whole of this the spirit of lawless violence stalked unchecked for several centuries, and the many conflicts between city and city and State and State produced an almost general spirit of cruelty and unnatural hate. No such rivalries existed in the island, so that once the supremacy of the law was restored the way was clear for the arts of peace and the pursuit of national progress.

As for the laws of Sardinia, they form a very interesting study in themselves. They were a heterogenous collection, the product of different epochs, changing conditions and discordant social elements. The present system was the outcome of a codification completed in 1828, founded on the best of the old laws of the Aragonese and the decrees of the Spanish Viceroys, as well as the enactments of a much older code called the *Carta de Logu*. About this charter—which deserves to be styled an earlier *Magna Charta*—there centres a peculiar interest. It is possibly unique, in the fact that it was drawn up and established as the law of Sardinia by a woman.

She was Eleanor, daughter of the last Judge of Arborea (the island was then divided into four provinces, over each of which was a ruler called a Judge), and she was married to Brancalone Doria, one of that famous line of Genoese Doges and merchant princes. While her husband was fighting in the field against the Aragonese she administered the affairs of his territory and compiled laws for its equitable government. This task she carried out so completely as to deserve the highest encomiums of jurists and historians in all the succeeding centuries. The chronicler of Sardinia, Signor Manno, says of this code: "Whilst I was perusing these remains of an old civilization it was not without a feeling of national pride that I repeatedly met with this sentence: 'Let not the guilty escape for any sum or consideration whatsoever'—a sentence which, discarding all pecuniary composition, in cases of high misdeeds, raises the laws of Eleanor above those of most contemporary nations, where the wealthy could almost always evade judicial punishment, which thus fell upon the poor with double severity, and became in fact an act of injustice toward the latter." Eleanor of Sardinia was in fact a feminine Solon of the Middle Ages—the equal of Stephen Langton or Simon de Montfort. Taken as a whole, the code of the Lady Eleanor of Sardinia compares favorably not only for wisdom and justice, but for humanity, with the highest achievements in law making, either of the ancient era or the Christian period. Capital punishment was not decreed in it except for the highest crimes—viz., murder, forgery, counterfeit coining and rape. Conspiracy against the State, which in almost every other country was accounted as high treason, punishable with torture and death, was under this code punishable only by fine. It is remarked by Cavaliere Manno that the phraseology of the code is, unlike other legal or judicial compositions, free from ambiguity, redundancy or prolixity, and leaves but little room for legal quibble. Could it be that when Shakespeare was drawing the character of Portia, he had in his mind the case of this mediæval Minerva of Arborea?

Sardinia prospered under the sway of Savoy rulers, until the line gave out in the direct current. Then the subaltern branch of Carignan-Savoy succeeded—the line to which the renowned Prince Eugene belonged. Carlo Alberto Amadeo—usually called Charles Albert—was called to the throne on the death of Charles Felix, in 1831. Then began the new era of Sardinian trouble. The storm long brewing over Europe had its focus in Italy. There the spirit of revolution, which had been smouldering for many decades, under Austrian repression, since the overthrow of the Italian Republics, began to assume the fiercest and most formidable character. Charles Albert, never having dreamed of being called upon to assume the

crown himself, had been an active plotter against monarchy. It is believed that he was a member of the Carbonari, as Louis Napoleon was also said to have been. Whatever be the truth of that assertion, the fact is that he had become so involved in the revolutionary vortex before he ascended the throne that he was no longer master of his own actions, but was irresistibly whirled along with the seething current. War with Austria became inevitable, when he had once thrown in his lot with the Mazzinians; and though he won some minor successes in the field, he was destined to be the victim of his rash ambition. At Novara and Custoza his star went down in black defeat; and the unfortunate King soon found himself without any alternative but surrender to Austria or abdication. The latter course he elected to take, leaving his uneasy crown to his son, Victor Immanuel II., grandfather of the present King of Italy.

It is not pertinent to this retrospect to follow the thorny road of Italian politics since the demise of Sardinia and Piedmont as separate States. When the fortunes of both became identical with those of "United Italy" their period of growth terminated. Turin has declined since it ceased to be the capital of the kingdom, as Florence in its turn declined after it had been forsaken as Turin was, in the onward march of ambition. Sardinia is unprogressive and stagnant, having lost its position as a flourishing monarchy and relapsed into dull provincialism. Still it enjoys peace. Its isolated position protects it from the excitement and turmoil of the agitations which sporadically convulse society on the mainland. If the nation is happy that has no history, then Sardinia must be in a state of bliss. If Piedmont can be consoled for the loss of her dignity as a ducal State with a royal capital, by the bestowal of its title on a prince of the royal house, then all is well with Piedmont likewise.

But there is a deeper question. When the House of Savoy abandoned its ancient traditions and accepted the new theories of democracy, it committed itself to a programme which might seem to involve, logically, the suspension of a new sword of Damocles over its own head in case it ever made a false step, or one that might be construed into a movement against the new theories of democratic freedom. The tenure by which the weapon is held may be estimated by the remarks of Sismondi, the historian of the Italian Republics. He says in his concluding chapter: "The object of men united into society being that of securing to each other the protection of their persons, property and honor, and respect for their moral sentiments, any government which should wantonly sacrifice or expose the same, which should offend against justice, humanity or public decency, would be utterly deficient in its object, and ought to be considered as a tyranny, even if established by the

will or the caprice of the whole community." What follows from such a decree? The individual who has satisfied himself that he is superior in judgment to the collective wisdom of the whole community is face to face with what he believes to be a tyranny, and naturally ought to take action suitable to such an intolerable position. Such were the views held by the men with whom the new departure in the House of Savoy was taken, and they made no secret of them. It was dangerous company to travel with, as poor King Humbert found to his cost. Better for him had his grandfather decided to stand upon the ancient ways—better, probably, for all Italy, too.

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

Philadelphia.

THE FRIARS' ESTATES IN THE PHILIPPINES.

A RELIGIOUS order, like any other corporation, must have the means of subsistence if it is to live and do its work. To deny it that right is simply to proscribe it from the face of the earth. The means may come either in the form of recompense for spiritual services rendered, given by way of fees and voluntary collections in the churches, as in the United States, or as a salary from the government, as was the case in the Philippines in Spanish times. Or the entire income may be derived from purely voluntary alms without any reference to services rendered, as witness the Franciscans, wherever they carry out their peculiar rule to the letter. The possession by religious bodies of large properties, either worked by themselves or by tenants, has been consecrated by the usage of the older orders of monks from the primitive times of St. Benedict. The obvious advantage of landed capital is its stability, its natural growth and the wealth it brings in its train by industry and economy, wealth which may be used in furthering great works of charity after supplying the modest wants of the members of the order. A familiar example of this was La Chartreuse, in France, where, in addition to the ordinary sources of revenue from the estate, the manufacture of the famous liquer brought in an annual fortune, all of which went in works of charity. It is a peculiarly noble idea for a corporation to secure the independence of wealth by patient industry and self-denial in order that its members may be able to render charitable services without being obliged to ask anything in return. That was the

position of the University of Santo Tomas in Manila, which, without any public endowment, gave gratuitously higher education to thousands of Filipinos, doing as estimable a work as could be conceived. Such, however, is the hatred of religious orders in modern times, inspired over a great part of the world by Latin Freemasonry, that no truce will be made with them on any terms, and they are grudged the possession of wealth, whatever beneficent objects or works of public utility they may apply it to.

Contempt and calumny dog the footsteps of religious at every turn. If they live on alms they are "beggarly friars" (Foreman)—nothing so low is conceivable. If they receive fees for spiritual ministrations they are making a trade of religion and practising extortion on the poor. If they get a salary from the government they are robbing the State, even when the State is merely making restitution for robberies committed on the Church; they are "salaried employés" and, in the Philippines, "spies of the Spanish Government." If by economy and honest labor, prolonged through centuries, they have acquired landed estates and dispose of wealth, the eye of envy is more widely opened than ever, and they are "living in the lap of luxury, eating up the land, living on the fat of the land," and prompted by cupidity the unworthy cry is raised of the necessity of confiscating their property and devoting it to the common needs of the State. So that whatever means they may adopt, they find it impossible to live and work without exciting the rancorous jealousy of their enemies, their fate being never to be regarded by the world in a spirit of justice and fair-dealing. It is a recognized principle that every man is entitled to a reward for his labor; an exception is made against them. It is also generally recognized as highly praiseworthy for a man to devote his wealth to philanthropic objects as he conceives them; his methods are discussed without adverse criticism; but in the case of religious orders the chorus of condemnation raised against their wealth drowns whatever faint praise may have been accorded them for the noble manner in which they have used it.

In the Philippines the bitter ordeal of misrepresentation through which the religious orders had to pass with regard to their estates may be said to be over. The question is now relegated to the limbo of history, and the writer who discusses it at the present time will be less suspected of partiality than before. The atmosphere, moreover, has been cleared in more ways than one by the sale of the estates to the American Insular Government. The actual payment of the money to the friars on the production of clear titles has put the quietus on the theory so generally advanced that the greater portion of the lands was acquired by fraudulent practices, and the

detailed accounts given lately by the papers of their real extent and value have completely stifled the exaggerations so freely indulged in by American correspondents. The fabulous wealth of the friars has proved to be as great a myth as the milliard of francs given out in the French Chamber as belonging to the religious in France before their late dissolution.

A common mistake made by non-Catholic writers is that of confounding these estates with the property of the Church. Quite lately one of the American newspapers in Manila has addressed an open letter to the Archbishop of that city advocating the seizure of the moneys paid over by the government to the friars, that they might be applied to the general wants of the Catholic Church in the Philippines. The writer in his ignorance may have been actuated by laudable motives, but, nevertheless, it is well for him to be told that such a course would be confiscation pure and simple, and that no instance can be cited from ecclesiastical history in which property was taken from a religious order and handed over to Church dignitaries for general ecclesiastical purposes. Ordinary human rights over property are not disregarded by the Catholic Church. The estates were by no means church property in its technical sense, though they were in the hands of ecclesiastics. They belonged to ecclesiastical corporations, which had a right to hold property independent of all other bodies. The real church property in the Philippines has been made up from donations and legacies, from taxes on the parish priests and the accretion of funds accruing to the parish churches from the usual marriage and burial fees, one-eighth of which had to be set apart as church funds. All these moneys were controlled by the Bishops. On the other hand, the estates of the friars had come into being in the first instance from the savings out of the salaries of individual members and the private income of communities, and had increased in value and extent generally owing to the intelligent and economic administration of the estates themselves, under the direction of the lay Brothers.

In the rules and constitutions of the Dominican order in the Philippines, published some years ago in three volumes, it is interesting to trace, through the ordinations of the successive provincial chapters, the economic administration pursued in the early times and the heroic spirit of self-abnegation exacted from the friars. The great problem that presented itself to that order as well as to the others was the support of the head house in Manila, where the young priests got a training and the old found a refuge after their labors in the ministry; where also the administration and support of the missions in China, Tonquin and Japan called for

enormous outlay. At the beginning the head houses had nothing to depend on but the alms of the Spaniards, which must have been generous enough, judging from the gratitude constantly expressed for them in the acts of successive chapters. Though the King of Spain paid their passage out, the Spanish colonial authorities did not think it worth their while to set apart a site in the city for their habitation. The only site of a convent in Manila given gratis was that of the Augustinians who came with the first conquistadores and were present at the founding of the city. The other religious bodies who came later on had to lodge successively in one another's convents, first the Franciscans with the Augustinians, and, later on, the Dominicans with the Franciscans till money enough had been gathered to buy a site and erect a temporary dwelling. The site of the present magnificent convent of Santo Domingo was bought from a Spaniard and consisted of marshy land, which before he had banked it off from the river had been covered by water at high tide. The Jesuits for a long time did not succeed in getting a site within the city at all and had to build outside. It is thus clear that though the conventual property in Manila occupies such a large portion of the ground in the walled city, it was not by lavish endowment from the government, as is generally supposed, but at the cost of much labor and many hardships by bodies of men who for nearly three centuries formed almost a third of the population of the Philippines, even when we include the common soldiers.

For several years after the friars had settled in the country landed estates were not thought of in connection with the head houses and the general administration. The early system pursued by the Spanish Government did not readily adapt itself to the possession of landed estates other than by the *encomenderos*. These were men who in return for services rendered or money spent in the conquest of the islands got the governorship of a certain number of native villages and had the right to the tribute collected from them. The right to the tribute was afterwards taken away, owing to the many abuses it caused, and tracts of unoccupied land were given in compensation by the government. It was these estates, possessing a real and indisputable title, that afterwards formed by far the larger portion of the friars' property, for in course of time their owners, finding a much easier and more lucrative occupation in the foreign commerce of Manila than in clearing their holdings and developing their agricultural resources, offered them for sale, and a large number thus fell into the hands of the friars by purchase.

Before the purchase of the estates which were to supply the general needs of the orders and the expenses of their head houses

in Manila the fathers scattered on the missions had to be heavily taxed for that purpose. For the needs of their order the Dominicans taxed themselves to the amount of sixteen per cent. on the missionaries in Cajayan, thirty per cent. on those in Panjasinan and fifty on those in Bataan and the parish of Binondo. The taxes must have been taken almost wholly from the miserable salaries then allowed by the government, for church fees were next to nothing, the fee for marriage, for instance, being only two reales (ten cents), one-half of which was to go to the sacristan and the other to the registrar. We learn from the ordinations and rules that the fathers were not allowed to purchase or keep any land except a small kitchen garden. They could not grow maize or rice or do any trading such as buying in wild bees' wax. They were allowed, however, to keep three cows for the supply of milk, a great boon indeed, for chocolate was forbidden as too great a luxury, coffee not to be had and wine was only for the use of the altar. In course of time it was thought desirable to relieve them of all taxation for general purposes except an occasional special call, but as the expenses of the order increased with the great development of the missions in China, Tonquin and Japan, and the opening up of new missions in the Philippines which had to be partially supported until they were strong enough to support themselves, some new resources had to be sought for. This was why the estates were bought by the Dominican Order, and the same reasons will hold good for the Augustinians and Recoletos.

We may here call attention to the fallacy of the theory that makes the estates to have grown up out of the resources of the parishes, as if the parish priests had utilized their spiritual position for the purpose of gathering wealth. The general custom was, on the contrary, that all the money coming to the priest by his salary and church fees was spent in the parish itself; in fact, the parish priests never showed much anxiety to contribute to the provincial when he came on his visitation. The parishes had no relation whatsoever with the estates. The famous Imus estate did not become a parish till 1795, and up till 1860 the whole province of Cavite, in which so much of the property of the friars was located, did not have more than one friar parish priest, all the parishes but one being under the ministry of native clergymen. Calamba also, the great estate of the Dominicans, was served by a native clergyman up to the year 1888, the period of the troubles there with the tenantry, when the anti-rent campaign was begun. It was a rare exception for a friar priest even to reside on the estates. If the friars had acted like the Protestant missionaries in Hawaii, whose sons within the space of one generation became large landowners

and controlled the trade of the islands, they could have had an estate in every parish they served in the archipelago and have gathered untold millions during the three last centuries. But though most of the agricultural development of the country—north, south, east and west—is principally due to them, they acquired the ownership of comparatively a small amount of land for their own use.

When we say for their own use we do not mean that their wealth was used exclusively by the head houses in Manila and the general administration in supplying their own necessities and carrying out their own educational system. It is true that the expenditure involved in supporting the colleges in Spain in which their students were educated, and in the upkeep of their churches and convents in Manila was enormous. How many Americans who enter the Manila churches on great feast days, when, amidst lavish illuminations and gorgeous decorations, they listen to exquisite music rendered by well-trained choirs, stop to consider where the money comes from that makes all this possible? Such a thing as a church collection is unheard of; entrance to the churches is free to all, poor and rich. The divine worship of God in all that splendor is possible only by great outlay on the part of the orders, though at the same time it must be acknowledged that abundant help is also given in Manila by pious Spaniards and mestizos and even sometimes by pure natives. I know that the expenses of one church in Manila amounted last year to \$12,000. Again, the higher education, collegiate and university, they imparted to 10,000 young Filipinos before the revolution had to be supported from the same funds, entirely as regards the university and partially in the colleges, as the students did not pay an adequate pension. The erection of spacious colleges within recent years in Lingayen, Tujuyarao, Dagupan and Ilo-Ilo has been also at the entire expense of the orders. The richest Filipino in the country would smile at the idea of his being expected to contribute in any way to endow collegiate education for his fellow-countrymen. Another striking fact, the reason for which the Americans may not have fathomed, is the strange absence of beggars, even in Manila. The Filipino never gives alms. A poor man would never think of asking his neighbor for assistance in his necessities. He would ask him for the loan either of money or food, and this would be charged up against him with heavy interest, which he would be expected to work off by labor. In fact, the friars, who have been slandered by wealthy Filipinos as having taken everything they could and given nothing in return to the poor, have been the only almsgivers in the country. The poor have no need to beg in Manila, as they can get steady and abundant alms in the convents. For instance, at the Augustin-

ian convent \$80 are distributed regularly every month and \$220 on one great feast in the year. They also give \$200 to orphans annually. All the other convents likewise distribute regular alms. The Augustinians out of their common funds have endowed many chaplaincies in the provinces to provide for the support of auxiliary priests not allowed for by the Spanish Government, and, moreover, the missions founded for the wild tribes of Abra, Lepanto, Bontoc and Benguet have told heavily on their resources. As to orphan asylums and industrial schools built and endowed out of their own funds without any assistance from the charity of the public or the government, witness Guadalupe, Mandaloya, Pasig and Malabon, now, alas! in ruins, having been plundered and burned by the revolutionists, and their unfortunate inmates thrown on the world. The Franciscans, owing to their peculiar rule, could not possess estates themselves, but having got permission from Rome that the hospitals founded and served by them might possess them, the result of their charitable work may be seen in the hospitals of San Lazaro in Manila, San Lazaro in Palestina, Nueva Caceres and others at Los Banos, Cavite and Cebu. During the terrible epidemic of the cholera in 1821 all the orders came forward and gave lavishly, the Dominicans in particular handing in a sum of \$10,000 to the Manila municipality for the relief of the poor, for which as a voluntary recompense they received nine niches in the Paco cemetery. We may here remark that at all times medicines were supplied gratis by the friars to the sick. To the Dominicans also is due the supply of the drinking water to the city of Manila, for which act of generosity they have a perpetual use of the water gratis. The present municipality, in wretched contrast to the spirit of former times, have just passed a law taxing for the water supply orphanages and other asylums of the poor which formerly received it without payment. The Recoletos spent a vast amount of money out of their funds in sending help to their missionaries in Mindaro, Paragua and the Calamianes to help them to build churches and convents, and in some of the southern islands also used the same funds to build forts mounted with cannon in order to protect the priests and their flocks from the incursions of the piratical Moros. Nearly all the roads, bridges and other public works in the country were made by the friar parish priests, and it is incredible what sums were sent to them from time to time by the heads of the orders to help them to open up the country by road and bridge-making, a work so sadly neglected by the Spanish Government. Fr. Juan Villaverde, a great road-builder in Nueva Viscaya, cost his order more than \$25,000. In peace and in war they gave help to the impecunious Spanish Government, who looked to them for help

in times of public disaster, epidemics, earthquakes, famines, and never showed much gratitude afterwards. The conclusion forced upon us is that it would be impossible to find in the world another body of men who have acquired wealth with greater moderation or used it with better judgment or more lavish generosity.

The Jesuits, the most powerful of all the religious bodies in early times in the Philippines, were the first to appreciate the advantages to be derived from owning and cultivating estates, and bought them in largely, being possessed at the time of their unjust and cruel expulsion from the colony in the eighteenth century of several times over the amount of property held by the orders of friars all taken together. The accruing wealth was principally used by them for the furtherance of higher education among the natives. Besides the University of San José in Manila, they had several colleges and seminaries for natives through the provinces and trained great numbers for the priesthood. Not only did they give a great impetus to agriculture, but they endeavored to develop an industrial movement and started manufactures of silk and cotton, which, however, owing to the natural indolence of the natives and the overwhelming competition from China, did not prove a success. All their property, after their expulsion from the colony in 1768, passed into the hands of the Crown and was looked after by royal commissioners, who during the thirty years they administered it allowed everything to fall into neglect, dams and irrigation canals being permitted to remain unrepaired. In a few years once highly cultivated land became like a wilderness. The cupidity of the King had given the colony a blow from which it took a long time to recover. The estates were sold one after the other in course of time and passed with all their improvements into the hands of native families and others, some of whom hold them to the present day.

The possessions of the Dominican Order before the revolution amounted to about 50,000 hectares. In the province of Cavite there were the estates of Naic and Santa Cruz, in La Layuna there was Calamba, Biñan and Santa Rosa, in Bataan there was Lomboy, Parti and Orion. Some of these estates had belonged to the order for more than two centuries. They were principally devoted to the cultivation of rice, for which they were naturally suited, extensive irrigation works having been put up at great cost by the friars. In La Laguna, however, a certain mount of sugar was raised. There was a good deal of timber on some of the land and cattle was raised in a few places. None of the land was farmed by the order, but was rented out to tenants on very easy terms, as we shall shortly see. All improvements were made by the friars. The estates were managed by lay Brothers of the order, who exercised

a general supervision and collected the rents. The rent was paid on rice lands either in rice or in money, as the tenant wished; on sugar lands it was always paid in money.

The property of the Augustinians amounted altogether to 60,000 hectares, but 20,000 of these, the amount in the valley of the Cagayan river, should be considered apart as belonging to a very special category. In 1880 Moriones, the Governor General, desiring to further the growth of tobacco in Cagayan, insisted on the orders taking large tracts of land in that valley, hoping that they would develop the natural riches of that part of the country. The land was desolate and unoccupied, and he looked to them as the best civilizing influence that could be brought to bear on it. It is a rich country, capable of supporting four millions of people, but has been always very sparsely populated and even now the whole valley, comprising Cagayan, Isabela and Nueva Viscaya, has not more than 170,000 inhabitants. The friars did not want these estates, and took them very reluctantly; the Franciscans refused them absolutely, as it would be against their rule to hold possession of them. The next Governor General, Primo de Rivera, wanted to take them back. The Dominicans and Recoletos gave up their estates willingly, but the Augustinians, who had spent considerable sums of money in clearing the land and bringing colonists to it from Ilocos, refused to give it up without compensation.

The rest of the property of the Augustinians was all bought from Spaniards, and some of the title deeds go back to the sixteenth century. Four estates were acquired in the seventeenth century, two in the eighteenth and two in the nineteenth. These deeds, given in evidence to the American Commissioners, dissipated the erroneous impression created by partisan writers that the friars got royal grants of land at the beginning of the conquest. The Augustinian lands were all situated in the provinces of Manila, Bulacan and Cavite, with the exception of 6,000 hectares in Cebu. Like the Dominican estates, they were all rented out to tenants after having been improved by irrigation and drainage.

The Recoleta friars possessed, roughly speaking, about 35,000 hectares, 23,000 of which was grazing land in the poorly populated island of Mindaro. The estate of Imus, in the province of Cavite, consisted of 11,000 hectares, the first parcel of which was bought in 1686. More than a million dollars were spent on this estate in improvements. They had also house property in Cavite, the title deeds of which were destroyed by the revolutionists at the time of the blockade of Manila by the Americans. The same system of administration was pursued on their estates as on the estates of the other orders.

Surprise may be felt by those ignorant of the circumstances of the country of the enormous extent of most of these estates. However, the principle once admitted that it is perfectly just and lawful for friars as well as any other men to own estates, it does not change the nature of the case whether they are large or small, or worked on a large or a small scale, and if the friars added to them from time to time, it was simply because rice lands, which they principally were, could be worked with greater efficiency and with greater benefit to themselves and their tenants on a large than a small scale.

No small proprietor, unless very well situated by the banks of a river, can irrigate with profit. If several attempt to irrigate near the same waters it is a constant source of disputes and litigation. If, on the other hand, a proprietor gets control of a whole countryside, dams the rivers up in the hills and digs tunnels and canals in every direction, conveying the fertilizing waters over square miles of land, he creates unknown possibilities in the way of production and paves the way for a dense population. Rice may be planted in the rainy season on land where no artificial irrigation is available. The result will be one annual crop, scanty and uncertain. When rice is planted on irrigated land the result will be three abundant crops in the year almost of a certainty, thus more than trebling the production. Almost all the irrigation works in the Philippines have been done by the friars, a few by individual Spaniards, none by the Spanish Government and none by Filipinos. In modern times some large dams in Pangasinan and elsewhere have been made by the parish priests for the general utility with the help of their parishioners. The acquisition of these lands did not throw out old proprietors. They had never been occupied by the Filipinos, and, as we have seen, were acquired by purchase from the Spanish proprietors when the latter wanted to get rid of them. They were not a very desirable investment at the time they were purchased, for the population, being small, it would be only at the cost of enormous improvements, including works of irrigation, that natives would be induced to leave their independent holdings and come and live as tenants, paying a trifling rent that would hardly cover the outlay incurred. Altogether, taking the value of the land and the continual expenses incurred in improvements, they did not bring in more than three or four per cent., a percentage which could easily have been obtained by the friars in solid foreign securities without any labor on their part. But the friars had no desire of abandoning the rôle they played of public benefactors nor relinquishing the great share they were taking in the development of the country by the careful and efficient management of their

estates. On these estates, as everywhere else, they did their best to overcome the natural inertia of the Filipino, and tried hard to make him advance in spite of himself. It is remarkable how utterly helpless to advance the native is when left to himself. Even when he has acquired riches he would never think of turning them into an industrial channel, and seems to know no other way of making money produce money than by letting it out at usury to his fellow-countrymen. Besides he is naturally a spendthrift, and can dissipate a fortune in a short time that has taken him a lifetime to acquire. So he allowed the friars to direct him, to make the crooked ways straight and the rough ways plain; to expend their energy in raising him out of his slothful ways and giving him the opportunity of making himself rich, and then, because in the course of centuries, owing to their prudence, economy and careful management, the friars themselves gathered riches, the ungrateful spendthrift and gambler now turns on them and accuses them of having "exploited the country." This expression was used by Aguinaldo in a letter addressed to General Otis, in which he made the whimsical complaint that the friars had "created vast agricultural colonies." As he referred principally to the province of Cavite, where his home was situated, the examination of a few historical data will confirm the fact that the friars did create colonies, though it seems a want of ordinary common sense to put it forward as the subject of complaint. When the Spaniards first came to the islands the whole population of Cavite consisted of two small villages, known as Bacoor and Old Cavite. The first well authenticated census, that of 1735, taken about fifty years after the Recoletos had acquired the great hacienda of Imus, which included the village of Bacoor, gives the whole population of the province at that time as less than 6,000, including all classes, Imus containing 682 and Bacoor 558 souls, respectively. The following tables, showing the wonderful increase in population, prove that the friars did not practise that kind of landlordism that depopulates a country, but must have, on the contrary, exercised a wonderfully attractive influence:

Population of Province of Cavite.		Population of the estate of Imus.	
1735	5,904	1735	1,240
1799	33,302	1799	6,382
1850	126,627	1850	28,150
1877	132,064	1896	31,703

Judging by the wonderful increase shown in these tables, there could not have been more than 200 people, or forty families, on the estate in 1686, when they bought it from the Spanish owners for \$21,500.

It may be thought that the natives crowded on to the friars' estates because they had no other place to go to, but the fact

that there is still a tract of country several miles in width between Cavite and Batangas largely unoccupied, yet well suited for the cultivation of wheat and fruits of various kinds as well as the rearing of cattle, shows that the natives felt it was more to their advantage to be under the friars, paying a small rent, than to be their own masters. Such has been the desire of the natives in recent times for friar land that outgoing tenants have been paid up to \$500 for the right to take up a farm. The Imus estate as well as those belonging to the Dominicans in the same province have transformed it completely, for, unlike Pangasinan and some other provinces, its low-lying lands are not naturally fertile.

As regards Imus specially, the irrigation and other works are of enormous magnitude, and it has taken more than two centuries of expense and labor to bring them to their present form. There are forty-five large dams for restraining the waters in the mountains, one known as the Presa del Molina having taken eleven years to construct at a cost of \$90,000. There are twenty-eight tunnels bored through the lower hills, thirty-eight large canals and forty-one smaller ones, spanned by nineteen stone bridges. The works altogether are calculated to have cost nearly a half a million dollars, and if they had to be made over again by government, the cost would certainly amount to three or four million dollars. But the friars themselves being the architects and engineers and labor being cheap and more efficient under their management, a work was accomplished which was absolutely beyond the powers of the Spanish Colonial Government, who can show nothing to compare to it. Praise is freely accorded to men in other states of life who accomplish such works. Why is it denied to the friars? In addition to the irrigation works the friars constructed several roads at their own cost through the estate, bringing every part in easy communication with the other and facilitating the transportation of agricultural produce.

The ears of the public have been assailed for a long time by the persistent accusations made against the friars that they were rack-renting landlords, accusations spread abroad by their enemies to induce the American authorities to confiscate their land. Now that the estates have been paid for, we have probably heard the last of the accusations, but still it is well to hinder as far as possible a false tradition from being formed. The plain unvarnished truth is that the friars were the best landlords in the world. Their tenants paid only a small rent, much smaller than that paid to the native proprietors, were well treated and looked after in every respect, and at the cost of a trifling amount of labor lived well and had abundance of food.

Father Zuñiga, a well-known author, who traveled through Luzon in the year 1800, in company with the admiral of the Spanish fleet, makes very interesting remarks concerning the friars' estates which he visited on his journey, and as his book was written a hundred years ago, long before controversy had blinded men's minds, his account will naturally be received as impartial. Regarding the reason of the extraordinary lowness of the rents, he says that the friars had at first found a difficulty in getting tenants on the estates, and only overcame it by offering the farms at a very low rent, hardly corresponding to the value of the products even at that time, and that when the price of things arose the tenants were not willing to pay anything more. A small rise had been made just before his time on account of the tithes imposed by the government. Tithes, either Church or King, had never been imposed on the natives, but only on the Spaniards. The friars had escaped so far on the plea that their estates were rented out to the natives and not worked by themselves. However, the government insisted on getting them, and as it was plain that the natives would rather abandon their farms than pay the tax, the friars compounded with the government for a fixed sum, which they paid themselves, compensating themselves by slightly raising the rent. The rent on rice lands then, as in recent times, was about one-tenth of the total produce, and the native produced abundant crops with very little labor to himself. Zuniga also remarks on the abject laziness of the natives. He says that the highly cultivated estates of the friars near Parig river would give the false impression that they were more industrious there than elsewhere, but the real reason was that each was content to cultivate a small plot and worked for the present without giving heed to the morrow.

Many of the natives in modern times, possessing a little more enterprise than the others, became rich, drove their carriages in Manila and were able to send their sons to Europe to be educated. The farms passed down from father to son for several generations, and as long as they paid the trifling rent agreed upon there was no such thing as an eviction, though no regular lease was granted after the first three years. If the crops did not come up to the usual standard, the rent was lowered in proportion. If a tenant took up uncleared land he paid no rent for three or four years; in fact, the general custom was to pay no rent for the first two years anywhere, and if he required capital for working the land, as was generally the case owing to the improvidence of the people, it was lent to him *without interest*, to be paid back as he was able. There was thus no quicker or surer way of getting rich than by becoming a tenant of the friars. Rizal's father, who came to the Dominicans

in Calamba a poor boatman, by getting capital from them free and land almost free, made a fortune in a few years. The great desire of the lay Brother managers was to promote the interests of the tenants without a thought of self. What had they to gain for themselves in this life? They worked for a higher and nobler end. They may be seen now, those men who handled large sums of money and presided over great engineering works—one an infirmarian and another a porter in their convents in Manila, just as pleased with their present position as with the former. "I have made many men rich in my day," said an old infirmarian lay Brother, whom I had known for months without being aware he had been manager of a large estate. "How was that?" said I. "By lending them money," he replied, and then he explained to me the system of furnishing capital to promising tenants without either security or interest, which enabled many a poor man to acquire an independent position in a few years.

In Imus for the site of a house extending to 180 square yards the tenant paid the annual rent of 32 cents. For mango trees, the fruit of which often brought \$30 a tree, 12 cents. For a clump of bamboo, a tree which is of such general utility in the Philippines, 6 cents, the tenant receiving also full rights to cut wood on the mountain. The land itself was classed into first, second and third quality, and the rent arranged accordingly was paid in rice, generally amounting to one-tenth of the total produce. The labor entailed on the tenant was very little. He had only to let the water in over his land, turn over the soft mud with the plough, plant the rice with the help of his neighbors, he helping them in turn, and his work was accomplished with the exception of letting the water in three or four times during the growth of the cereal. He was generally able to idle most of his time during the year. Out of two quinions of land, one devoted to rice and the other to sugar (a quinion being about 12 acres) a tenant could make about \$1,700 free of all expense, a sum which should certainly have enabled him to live well and put by something for the future. Very few, however, were of a saving disposition, and they generally found means of disposing of their money in fiestas, fine clothes, jewelry and the cockpit.

A great difficulty encountered by the managers was the tendency to sub-let, a practice absolutely forbidden in the agreements. The friars desired to deal directly with their tenants and were determined to keep down the extortionate practices of middlemen. The beneficial rule, however, might be eluded in two ways. A tenant might contract a debt with another man, a money lender, or perhaps as the result of gambling; his creditor would quietly take over the

land and work him as a slave on it without any one else being a wit the wiser. Or a tenant might sub-let secretly to another man, getting from him more than twice the ordinary rent and living at his ease, while the sub-tenant would represent himself as a paid laborer. This shows the competition there was for the friars' lands.

Zuniga, speaking of his own time, says that the tenants sold or pledged their land to rich people, or sub-let them at such a high figure that they were able to receive more without working than the friar proprietors. The sub-letting was prohibited, and the tenants could be evicted according to the rules, if found out, but it was easy to conceal the transaction. The estate of Biñan in Laguna was altogether in the hands of the rich, who by their infamous secret arrangements with poor people in their power worked it by their means and gave them hardly anything in return. These poor people, who were generally working off usurious debts, were known as *casamatianes*. He also remarks that the tenants used to ruin one another by lawsuits. In each town there were a few men who, being able to speak and write Spanish, used to get a living by stirring up litigation. One of these literati would tell a tenant that another man's land belonged to him, having been the property in far-off times of his grandfather, and would confuse the poor man by a supposed intimate knowledge of the past transactions of his ancestors. Sometimes the same gentleman would go to the opposite party and make his case up for him, for a consideration, of course. A long and fruitless lawsuit would often end by the land coming into the possession of some rich Chinese half-breed of Manila who had lent money to both parties to enable them to go to law. Our author remarks that if a stop were not put to such proceedings most of the land in the country would get into the hands of these Chinese half-breeds. This seems to have been the case as regards Cavite, where the half-breed Chinese increased immensely during the last half century and furnished most of the leaders to the revolution.

The amusing account of the pettifogging lawyers of those days brings to our mind the rigmarole accounts and old woman fables sent into the Taft Commission by Felipe Calderon, the Manila lawyer, and published in the report. No claim on land is too extravagant for a Filipino, who having no sense of honor, goes on the principle that he will be none the poorer for making an application for what is not his own. The firm of McLeod & Co. about thirty years ago bought a piece of land in the city of Cebu from the Augustinians, for which the latter had a royal charter dated from the seventeenth century, yet natives have been lately troubling the firm with their pretended claims on it.

On estates owned by natives the tenants not only have had all along to pay a far higher rent, but they were kept entirely in the power of their masters by loans lent at exorbitant interest. The usual system pursued by native proprietors was that a tenant working the land with his own cattle would be allowed two-thirds of the produce; if he used the cattle of his master he was allowed only one-half. Being generally in an impecunious position, the tenant allowed his master to pay his taxes, marriage and burial fees and most of his outlay for feasts and gambling, all of which was put down in the books against him charged up with usurious interest. The consequence was that they were and are at the present moment in the condition of mere serfs. A good deal might be also said about the relations between the native proprietors and the daughters of the tenants. However, it is sufficient to remark that the richer and more powerful the Filipino is, so much the more vicious he becomes, and he allows nothing to stand in the way of his passions. During all the tirades made by the Filipinos, many of them land proprietors, before the Taft Commission, nothing came to light about the tyranny and malpractices usual on the estates belonging to the natives.

The campaign against the friars was inaugurated by Rizal in 1886 by the publication in Europe of his villainous book against them, "*Noli me tangere*." About the same time he and his associates thought it would be a good plan to give the campaign an agrarian character by representing his fellow-countrymen as poor, suffering tenants oppressed by rich and powerful friar landlords, who possessed most of the land of the country and were running it for their own profit. He thus thought to enlist the sympathies of Europe at the outset. He therefore wrote to his father, telling him not to pay any more rent, neither he nor the other tenants, but to send it all on to him, as he was arranging with the Spanish ministers in Madrid to have the friars ousted out of the country. The tenants on the Calamba estate, on which his father was the largest tenant, took him at his word, and for five years nothing could be got from them, though every means of gentle persuasion was used. At last the Dominicans had to bring the matter into the courts, and the case was appealed from court to court till the final decision was given in their favor by the Supreme Court in Madrid. Even then they refused in a body to go out in order to bring about the dramatic scene of being turned out by soldiers in the time of General Weyler. This, of course, was represented as an atrocious act of tyranny on the part of the Dominicans and Weyler, whose names were coupled together to make them all odious. Foreman speaks of the land in Calamba as having been rented on "tyrannical conditions to the

tenants." As he was on familiar terms with these tenants, a great friend of Rizal's father and knew the exact condition of things, this may be put down as one of the deliberate falsehoods with which his whole work is plentifully interspersed. General Younghusband, who is always rabid when he refers to the friars, writes: "In pursuance, therefore, of systematic perjury and rapacity, charges of various sorts were trumped up against Rizal's title deeds to his own estates, and these were bit by bit whittled away and bit by bit transferred to the interesting clerics who worked this infamous transaction."

Now what are the plain facts of the case? Rizal's father, a Chinese mestizo, that is, the son of a Filipino mother and a Chinese father, the latter probably unknown, came to the Dominicans in Calamba looking for land on which to settle. He was at that time a poor boatman. The Dominicans gave him a large tract of land, part of it uncleared, for which he had to pay no rent at all for two years, and received the capital to work it out of a fund of several thousand dollars kept by the friars as a perpetual fund to be lent without interest to deserving tenants. Rizal was a hard-working and energetic man and devoted himself to the cultivation of sugar, which though far more profitable a crop than rice, was neglected by the tenants in general owing to the extra labor and trouble involved. After several years of hard work he had 1,500 acres under sugar cultivation, with two large steam mills for crushing the cane erected at the cost of some thousands of dollars. He had also twenty acres under rice for the use of his family and numerous laborers and dependents. All he had to pay for his land was \$250 rent, though he was drawing a clear annual profit of \$25,000. In time he bought a large estate of his own, which he worked on the tyrannical Filipino plan already alluded to and sold clothes and other articles to his tenants, charging them up in his books at exorbitant rates. He also had the name of being very hard on the poor laborers employed on his sugar plantations, but tyranny practised by the rich Filipinos on their poorer brethren is so general as to pass unnoticed. In time also he secretly made himself master of some of the property of the other tenants, according to the usual custom. What professions of gratitude he made to the Dominican fathers whenever he came to Manila, sincere perhaps at the time, but—who knows the secrets of the human heart? This was the man whose son figured as the great opponent of the friars, who was determined to rid the country of their tyranny, who was spreading the most awful calumnies about them in Europe, when he was living like a prince on the rent money that rightly belonged to them. Only for the kindness and generosity shown by the friars to his father

he would probably have been all his life following his father's occupation as boatman.

When I visited Calamba some months ago I found that the Egasani family, who had been ringleaders with old Rizal in the anti-rent agitation, had been filling the heads of the American teachers with stories of oppression. According to their account, their father had had his rent raised on him to an exorbitant figure, and when he was not able to pay it the friars got him whipped and kidnapped away from his family. I need hardly remark that these are childish and calumnious fabrications. Nicasio Egasani, a common carter, came to the Dominicans many years ago and asked for land. He got a large amount of uncleared land free of rent for four years to give him time to clear it. At the same time he got capital lent to him free of interest to enable him to work it. In course of time his land amounted to 125 acres, for which he paid \$100 rent, which was at the rate of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the total produce. Afterwards he was able to farm twice as much, which he got at the same rental as the former. The site of his house and garden was given for 50 cents annually. No wonder that he became a rich man, able to squander sacks of silver in playing monte. The anti-rent campaign was inaugurated by he and old Rizal going round to the other tenants and threatening to cut their throats if they paid rent any more to the friars. As to the whipping and kidnapping, the only foundation it rests on is that when the agitation was developing into a local rebellion General Weyler very justly exiled these two worthies for a year or two to one of the other islands.

Coming across a tenant of the neighboring estate of Santa Rosa, I asked him why the American Government had bought the friars' land. Not being sure of his interrogator, he replied that it was because the people hated the friars and did not want them. On my inquiring for what reason he said it was owing to their tyranny and rack renting. I then asked him what the rents amounted to, and when he gave me the figures I laughed and told him the rents were nothing compared to what people paid in other countries. Thereupon, in true Filipino style, he turned completely round, praised the friars as good landlords who charged very little and helped their tenants along, and he added that far more rent was paid on the estates of native proprietors. I then asked him how it was that they were against the friars. "Oh!" said he, "that is the work of silly people on the other side of the mountains" (meaning Manila). I need hardly say this man had no conception of who or what I was.

A tenant in Calamba got a good stone house and garden for \$3 a year, or a bamboo house with garden attached for 50 cents.

For timber cut on the estate, 2½ cents a cubic foot. Land devoted to sugar was paid at the rate of \$15 for 5 hectares (about 14 acres) first quality, \$10 for same amount of land second quality and \$7.50 for third quality land. These are the "tyrannical conditions" (Foreman) on which the land was let in Calamba.

The following tables show the amount of land planted with sugar cane on the estate in 1896, as well as the total production of piculs (133 pounds), with value of the same and the amount of rent collected:

	Hectares	Value of sugar	Value of product	Rent
Calamba	5,072	301,880	\$452,820	\$8,768
Santa Rosa	2,707	164,676	247,014	5,176
Bifan	1,021	62,000	93,000	2,656
	<hr/> 8,800	<hr/> 528,556	<hr/> \$792,834	<hr/> \$16,600

Like the other orders, the Dominicans generally charged about ten per cent. of the total product for rice, but only one and a half per cent. for sugar, as there was much more labor and expense involved in this crop than in the former. If the product failed, the rent was abated in proportion. If a disease took away the cattle, the friars bought up others and replaced the losses of the tenants at cost price. A significant fact about the State of Calamba is that since the friars left the population has declined. Before they left it was eleven thousand; now it is only nine.

The Calamba episode aroused the cupidity both of Filipinos and of anti-clerical Spaniards who were anxious like many others to possess themselves of their neighbor's property when it was thought possible to do it by legal if not by lawful means. Many of the Spaniards in Manila, even of those who professed themselves friends of the friars, used to discuss in conversation the possibility of a general confiscation bringing some profit to themselves. In Spain the Filipino Junta worked up the same idea with the anti-clericals there, and articles appeared in the Spanish reviews written by Spaniards advocating confiscation on various grounds of utility and expediency. The banishment of the friars and confiscation of their estates was made a part of the programme of the *Liga Filipina* and the Katipunan Society, though the tenants of the estates showed no sign of discontent. The idea was not to relieve the tenants of the rent they paid, but to transfer the ownership to the government of the new Philippine republic they had in view. It was also put forward as a condition on the part of Fr. Aguinaldo and the other rebel leaders at the peace of Biac-na-bato, in 1897, according to themselves, but this is denied by the commissioner who treated with them on the part of the Spaniards.

It was confidently hoped by the revolutionists that the American

Government would, as a matter of course, banish the friars and confiscate their property, and the matter was urged on them persistently at the Sherman and Taft Commissions. The arguments used by their enemies were of the most flimsy character and were based, of course, on lying assertions. Señor Rosario, a doctor of law who had held a legal position under the Spanish Government, said that the friars claimed property which was not theirs; that all the world knew that the properties were gifts, and that they held them only as managers.

Señor Zerez y Burgos, a medical doctor, said that the friars had obtained their property by depredations on the towns, generally by threatening rich people about to die, warning them that they were likely to go to hell if they did not leave something to the Church, and also by encroaching upon other people's land, pushing their fences farther and farther out every year till they had absorbed all their neighbor's property. Señor Calderon, a lawyer, told the Commissioners that the friars had managed to get hold of the estates by putting up dams and charging the people for the use of the water, afterwards claiming the ownership of the land without any other title. Calderon showed in other ways a thorough knowledge of Philippine history, so that his evidence on this point must be put down as deliberate fabrication. Señor Melliza, a lawyer and judge under the Spanish Government and now Provincial Governor of Ilo-Ilo, also claimed that the property did not really belong to the friars, but had been given to them by the people, not for themselves, but for the welfare of the givers' souls for purposes of charity and education; that, moreover, the property had been legally seized by the revolutionists, as the friars were their enemies and had taken up arms against them. He finished by proposing the banishment of all Spaniards from the islands, friars and others, for fear they would create disturbances. José Albert, a medical doctor, whose life had been saved by the friars when arrested by the Spaniards for complicity in the revolution, urged their banishment. Angel Fabie said he did not care anything about their property, but if the government would determine to shoot the friars he would consent to it.

Is it not surprising that men, all of whom had got much of their higher education gratis at the University of Santo Tomas from the much-maligned friars, should not be ashamed to exhibit such base ingratitude to their benefactors before the world? Several of the most bitter opponents and calumniators of the friars had been charity boys, getting their food and clothing out of the estates that supported the university. Without the estates how would the friars have been able to keep open a university free to the three thousand Filipino students who frequented it before the revolution?

It was a woeful exhibition of duplicity and meanness, but fortunately it did not affect the object these men had in view. The American Government was not to be hoodwinked by their lying sophistries. The title deeds of the estates were examined and found to be perfectly valid, none others as clear in the whole country. As by the Treaty of Paris all private and ecclesiastical property was to be respected, there was only one of two courses to be pursued—either to let the friars return to the estates and help them to collect the rents, or else to buy out their interest. The government selected the latter course as more likely to hinder future complications. If the Spanish Government had remained in power for a few years longer it is probable that it would have sacrificed justice to expediency by confiscating the estates, thus buying off the opposition of the enemies of the friars. Spain, like all the other Latin countries, has had a disgraceful record in this respect. It is certainly better for friars to live in a country where, though Church and State are separate, their rights as ordinary citizens are respected, than to live under a government professedly Catholic, yet ruled by Freemasons and anti-clericals who utilize the union of Church and State to rob the former of its possessions whenever a chance is afforded.

It was thought that the friars would gladly welcome the four million dollars offered by the government for their lands, measured at 391,000 acres, more or less, together with houses, sugar mills, irrigating works and other improvements. The negotiations, however, came to a deadlock, as the friars valued their property at fourteen millions, a difference in valuation too immense to be easily bridged over. Moreover, it was found that the friars, foreseeing difficulties, had formed joint stock companies out of their possessions, retaining, however, for themselves the majority of the shares. The Recoletos as far back as 1894 had made a transfer of the estate of Imus to a company for the purpose, they said, of obtaining a regular income for the order and yet of being relieved of the burthen of collecting the rent and managing the property. Nevertheless the fact is that they retained full control and managed the property as formerly up to the time of the revolution.

The American Government insisted on the friars exercising their control in the sale of the lands in spite of the alleged rights of the companies. The matter dragged on without result till the end of 1903, when Governor Taft at last consented to raise his offer to \$7,239,784, which the friars accepted. The transfer papers were signed by him the very day before he resigned the Governorship of the islands and sailed for America. Bonds were immediately issued by the Insular Government and put on the market in the United States and, it appears, were fully subscribed to at once.

Within the last few weeks the Augustinians have been paid in full to the amount of \$2,076,000, and the other orders will also receive the money due to them as soon as they hand over their title deeds. Thus a matter of the highest importance has been amicably settled which would certainly have proved a bone of contention and disquietude for many years to come.

From conversations I had with some of the tenants on the estates and Filipinos in official positions, I found that they did not well understand the transaction. They could not conceive that the American Government would give such a large sum of money to the maligned friars. "Now that the estates are sold," said a notable anti-friar Filipino to me, "there will be no more difficulty about the friars; they were powerful because they were so rich." He evidently thought that the friars would not be paid. It must have caused general surprise and untold mortification to their mean opponents to see them getting the money due to them. Some are now urging that as the friars have been paid off, they are bound to leave the country, in accordance with a promise alleged to have been made by Leo XIII. to this effect. The Pope in reality made no such promise, and there is no immediate prospect of any more friars leaving the country; rather the contrary. Others are proposing that the money should be taken from them and applied to the general purposes of the Catholic Church in the islands, and that after being thus pauperized, with their title deeds and all rights to their former property gone, they should be hustled out. But this is only the savage and vindictive cry of a beaten bully.

It is a great boon to the friars that the payment of the money has been made so soon after the sale, for they were getting into financial difficulties owing to the long-continued non-payment of rent from the estates. Numbers of the tenants were quite willing to continue paying their rent to them if they had been let alone, as they often told them in Manila when they would visit them, but they were coerced all along by the anti-friar party and narrowly supervised. Most of them were charged three times over for the rent, first by the local municipality, who claimed it as their right, next by the Katipunan for revolutionary purposes, and sometimes also by the agents of Aglipay. Up to the present these unfortunate people have not gained by the revolution, and loud regrets have been heard from them regarding the change of masters. Owing also to the apathy and helplessness of the Filipinos when left to themselves, the magnificent irrigation works have been sadly falling into disrepair and the ground is not cultivated as carefully as formerly.

The idea of the government is to sell out the holdings to the actual tenants, the purchase money either to be paid outright or in small

yearly instalments, and this will probably take effect very shortly. The danger hanging over the tenants is that in the purchase of their holdings they may get into the usurious hands of their fellow-countrymen, who will fleece them mercilessly and sell them into bondage. The greater number of them may probably in time be reduced to the condition of peons or serfs on what will be legally their own farms. The absence, moreover, of a central authority and master mind will render the keeping of the dams and other irrigation works a matter of uncertainty and litigation, and altogether it is highly improbable that the tenants will find their new position as landowners an improvement on the old times when they were under the paternal rule of the friars.

AMBROSE COLEMAN, O. P.

Dundalk, Ireland.

CHATEAUBRIAND.

II.

CHATEAUBRIAND on his arrival at Havre had to write to his mother for money with which to pay for his passage. She sent it at once. She was at Saint Malo with her brother de Bédée, and his family and Lucile. Chateaubriand went there to consult with his uncle about his proposed emigration. Things were worse in France. The King's brothers had been proscribed, and the King never was spoken of now save as "Monsieur Veto" or "Monsieur Capet." The *sans-culottes* were enjoying the rare pastime of baiting royalty, and they were glutting themselves at it. The first question with the family circle at Saint Malo was to get more money for the impoverished René that he might join the Princes. "This conjuncture of circumstances decided the most serious step of my life; my family married me in order to procure me the means of going to get killed in support of a cause which I did not love," declares Chateaubriand with disdainful calm.

The happy young lady selected was Mlle. Buisson de Lavigne, granddaughter of a Knight of St. Louis living in retirement at Saint Malo. She was seventeen, "white, slender, delicate and very pretty; she wore her beautiful fair hair, which curled naturally, hanging low, like a child's. Her fortune was valued at four or five hundred thousand francs." Lucile, who was a friend of the girl, arranged the marriage which was to make her brother independent.

"Have your way," said I. "In me the public man is inflexible; the private man is at the mercy of whosoever wishes to seize hold of him, and to save myself an hour's wrangling I would become a slave for a century."

The girl's uncle, M. de Vauvert, "a great democrat," was the one note of opposition. He objected to his niece marrying an aristocrat. Chateaubriand's mother insisted that the religious marriage should be performed by a "non-juror" priest, which necessitated secrecy. The uncle found it out and let loose the law on the young couple. The law plucked the girl bride from her very indifferent husband and put her into a convent. Lucile at once constituted herself her companion there till she was released and restored to her spouse. Chateaubriand, whose simplicity and candor at times smack of brutality or coarseness, sums the case up thus: "There was no rape, breach of the laws, adventure nor love in the whole matter; the wedding had only the bad side of a novel: truth."

After this pettish explosion he does justice (?) to his wife. "It was a new acquaintance that I had to make, and it brought me all I could wish. I doubt whether a finer intelligence than my wife's has ever existed. Mme. de Chateaubriand has an original and cultivated mind, writes most cleverly, tells a story to perfection and admires me without ever having read two lines of my works; she would dread to find in them ideas that differ from hers or to discover that people are not sufficiently enthusiastic over my merit. . . . Often separated from me, disliking literature, to her the pride of bearing my name makes no amends. What happiness has she tasted in reward for her consistent affection? She has shared my adversities; she has been plunged into the prisons of the Terror, the persecutions of the Empire, the disgraces of the Restoration; she has not known the joys of maternity to counterbalance her sufferings. Can I compare an occasional impatience which she has shown me with the cares which I have caused her? Can I set my good qualities, such as they are, against her virtues, which support the poor, which have established the *Infirmière de Marie Thérèse* in the face of all obstacles? What are my labors beside the works of that Christian woman? When the two of us appear before God it is I who shall be condemned."

To which just summary of this *mariage de convenance* even the reader whom Chateaubriand charms into a sympathetic partisan must needs nod assent. Yet when this good woman died, only a year before her husband, he was so stricken by her decease that he pressed his hand upon his heart and exclaimed: "I have this moment felt life struck and withered at its source; it is now but a

question of a few months." This was probably sincere. It had been his earnest prayer that he might die before Madame Récamier, in order to be spared the aching void her passing would create for him. It should be borne in mind that Chateaubriand is writing of the marriage he contracted when he was twenty-four, thirty years later.

René and his wife, with Julie and Lucile, went to Paris. The King's flight in 1791 had caused the Revolution to take an immense step forward. When Louis XVI. was dragged back to Paris the National Assembly declared that it would henceforth make laws without any authorization of "Monsieur Veto." These were the days in which Danton, Marat, Camille Demoulins, Fabre d'Églantine and Robespierre, "those lovers of death," were gorging themselves upon blood. Chateaubriand says: "At this distance from their appearance, after descending into the infernal regions of my youth, I retain a confused recollection of the shades which I saw wander by the banks of the Cocytus." Small wonder. History then was an ensanguined blur of swift tragedies and changes.

After all, it soon appeared that Mme. de Chateaubriand's fortune was "tied up" so that borrowing became necessary. Chateaubriand secured a loan of 10,000 francs on his wife's securities. He was taking them home when he met an old messmate of the Navarre Regiment, Comte Achard, a great gambler, who invited him to his rooms. He lost all but fifteen hundred francs, and left that in the coach in which he drove home! After much search he found it again. "Failing that small sum I should not have emigrated; what should I have become?"

Finally, René and his brother and the latter's valet fly from Paris together to join the Princes committed to the Emigration. The most serious result of this movement was through the valet. He was a night-walker, escaped in a sonambulistic state, was captured and by his depositions served to prove the emigration of the others, with the ultimate result that Chateaubriand's brother and sister-in-law were sent to the scaffold. Become a soldier, Chateaubriand was wounded at Thionville, fell ill with dysentery and confluent small-pox seized him. He was honorably discharged and started with the aid of a crutch for Ostend, intending to go to Jersey, which he reached to pass four months between life and death at his Uncle de Bedée's at Saint Héliér. There is a certain pathos in his casual (?) statement that "the windows of my room came down to the level of the floor and I was able to see the sea from my bed." His nature had affinity with the sea, not sharing Jean Jacques's passion for mountains.

When he got well he decided to follow the example of M. de

Bedée's son and go to England to make his living. He felt touched at bidding farewell to this genial uncle. He was never to see again either him or his mother, or his sister Julie, or his brother. The packet on which he sailed for Southampton was crowded with emigrants, and he made the acquaintance of a Breton, François Hingant, who was to furnish Chateaubriand with much of the material for the "Genius of Christianity," while sharing hardships with him in London. His was a face which often rose to his memory in after years by reason of this association with his birth as an author and the most poverty-streaked stage of his career. On this ship he discovered Gesril playing chess in the captain's room. It was the last time he saw this domineering playmate of his Saint Malo boyhood. The bullying boy developed into a hero. He was shot with his companions at Quiberon, two years after this meeting, August 27, 1795, after a splendid exhibition of chivalric honor. As a lad of fourteen he fought in the American War of Independence. It was a not unnatural development of that kind of a boy in that kind of times.

With Chateaubriand's residence in London begins his literary career. He was shattered in health. The doctors said he might "last a few months (!)" and he was achingly poor. His cousin de Bedée sheltered him in a garret in Holborn. He conceived the idea of writing a work on the comparative Revolutions as one of timely interest. He had studied the latest and worst at close enough range. Peltier, a Breton emigrant, assisted the struggling *émigré* by getting him translations from Latin and English works to do by day, while he devoted the nights to his essay. But he only became poorer. With his keen appreciation of the violent contrasts in his life, he remarks that while penning this account of that poverty-stricken period of his career before he had published a thing, he had twice interrupted it to give magnificent functions at the embassy; one, a dinner to the Duke of York, the King's brother; the other, an eight-thousand-dollar party to celebrate the anniversary of the King's entry into Paris, on the 8th of July. "I have profited by these lessons; life, without the ills that make it serious, is a child's bauble."

He certainly had troubles, at home as well as in London. The papers told him of the execution at the same hour on April 22, 1794, of his brother (who was his godfather as well) and his brother's wife; of her mother, Madame la Presidente de Rosambo, and of her grandfather, Chateaubriand's encourager in his Polar ambitions, M. de Malesherbes, that sturdy defender of Louis XVI., who had preceded him to the guillotine by a year. Chateaubriand's mother had been flung into a cart in Brittany and carried to a grave in

Paris, while his wife and Lucile were awaiting sentence in dungeons at Rennes, charged with the crime of René's emigration! Surely a little bitterness, a pessimistic color in the essay on Revolution, on which he was engaged, may be forgiven him! His outlook on life from a little child had been one of vague sadness, which events in his subsequent existence deepened into melancholy. But with what poetic grace it is diffused throughout these *Mémoires* of a long and wonderfully diversified existence.

Chateaubriand's first and most idyllic love affair occurred during this London exile. He had romanced about the two Indian maidens in the Floridas. He now experienced for the first time real emotion of the heart. Charlotte Ives was the only child of an English clergyman. She was literary, studious "and sang as Madame Pasta sings to-day." This sweet girl fell in love with the poor but romantic French *émigré* of twenty-six, and the poetic Breton fully returned it. Charlotte ceased to sing and René was filled with dismay as the term of his visit at the Ives drew near and he had not the courage to speak out. Poor Mrs. Ives, seeing these young innocent creatures suffering in silence, learned their secret. She spoke to the young man, under a sort of compulsion, believing him dumb through diffidence or humility. She declared the willingness of Mr. Ives and herself to accept him as a son-in-law! He threw himself at her feet, covering her hands with kisses and tears. Then, as she made a movement to pull the bell-rope that would summon her husband and daughter—"Stop!" I cried. "I am a married man!" She fell back fainting.

"Since that time I have met with but one attachment sufficiently lofty to inspire me with the same confidence," Chateaubriand adds, in reference, unquestionably, to the touching friendship with Madame Récamier. In all of Chateaubriand's writing in these "*Mémoires*" the reader not only feels what is said, but more keenly how it is said and who it is that is saying it. Death was the only incident of his long career which left him without more sense of himself than of it, and his anticipations of that and of his memory surviving it run through the "*Mémoires*" as the illuminated work does through a Missal. But in this love for an artless English girl he is almost entirely preoccupied with the sweetness of the pure emotion quite apart from himself as modified by it. Nothing could better prove its intensity. It is also pleasant for the reader to recall that Madame de Chateaubriand, who at the time of this episode was in prison at Rennes, "never read two lines" of her husband's work!

Chateaubriand adds in regard to this sad virgin love of his heart, which was such a tragedy of sentiment, "that I became obsessed

by the mad ideas depicted in the mystery of René, which turned me into the most tormented being on earth."

M. de Fontanes, whom Chateaubriand met on his visit to Paris in 1789, had taken refuge in Lyons when the bad days began, returning to Paris after the 9 Thermider, only to be proscribed on the 18 Fructidor, when England became his refuge. There he met Chateaubriand again and was destined to have a great influence on his literary success. Chateaubriand says he was the last writer of the classic school in the elder line, and that his style of melancholy "fixes the date of his coming; it shows that he was born after Rousseau, while connected by taste with Fenelon. . . . If one thing in the world was likely to be antipathetic to de Fontanes, it was my manner of writing. With me began the so-called romantic school, a revolution in French literature; nevertheless, my friend instead of revolting against my barbarism, became enamored of it. I could see a great wonderment on his face when I read to him fragments of the "Natchez," "Atala" and "René;" he was unable to bring those productions within the scope of the common rules of criticism, but he felt he was entering into a new world. He gave to me excellent advice; I owe to him such excellence of style as I possess." The two became inseparable.

The "Essai sur les Révolutions" was published in London in 1797. Its publication was a turning point in Chateaubriand's life, according to himself, and made a stir among the Emigration, as it was opposed to their opinions. But now he had acquired a friend in Fontanes—"the first friend whom I had in my life"—who had become enamored of these romantic blossoms of his genius and who said to him: "Work, work, my dear friend, and become illustrious. You have it in your power; the future is in your hands." A man who devoted twelve or thirteen hours a day to writing, and who would copy and revise a thing a dozen times *was* a worker.

A still more important thing as concerned his writing, his life, his soul and his fame occurred shortly after Fontanes' departure from London. A letter from Julie, July 1, 1798, began thus: "Dear, we have just lost the best of mothers." The news plunged Chateaubriand into a passion of grief, due especially to the thought that he had been the cause of sorrow to that mother on her death-bed. "I flung copies of the 'Essay' into the fire with horror as the instrument of my crime; had it been possible for me to destroy the whole work I should have done so without hesitation. I did not recover from my distress until the thought occurred to me of expiating my first work by means of a religious work. That was the origin of the 'Genius of Christianity.' Julie had implored her brother to give up writing, and when he received her letter she

herself had died from the effects of her imprisonment. So there were two voices that plead to him from the grave. Julie, herself a charming writer of elegant verses, became *devote* before her death and her life is included in Abbé Caron's "Lives of the Just in the Higher Ranks of Society." As Lescure says: "Sorrow made Chateaubriand a Christian as wrath had made him a philosopher."

He began this most important of his works that very year, but completed it only in 1802. "I toiled with the ardor of a son building a mausoleum to his mother. I was devoured by a sort of fever during the whole time of writing. No one will ever know what it means to carry at the same time in one's brain, in one's blood and in one's soul 'Atala' and 'René,' and to combine with the painful child-birth of those fiery twins the labor of conception attending the other parts of the 'Genius of Christianity.' The memory of Charlotte penetrated and warmed all that, and to give me the finishing stroke the first longing for fame inflamed my exalted imagination."

An important change had taken place in France. Napoleon, become First Consul, was reducing chaos to order. To make friends of the distinguished body of Frenchmen who had been driven into exile he granted an amnesty to all of them with some exceptions. Many were returning. Fontanes urged Chateaubriand to come to Paris and finish the printing of the "*Génie du Christianisme*" there. But his dear old mother was gone; his fiery brother, his charming sister Julie. Lucile, to whom he had been united by such sympathy, was now Madame la Comtesse de Caud. Nothing in France spelt home. It was the breaking up of his little *émigré* circle in London that tipped the beam toward return. He concludes Part First of the "*Mémoires*" thus: "I stole into my country under the shelter of a foreign name; doubly hidden beneath the obscurity of the Swiss, La Sagne, and my own, I entered France with the century."

One little episode of the London exile deserves chronicling, recalled by the mention of Napoleon. Chateaubriand and Fontanes were on one of their exploring expeditions in London when a sudden storm drove them to shelter in the open door of a mean dwelling. Another had already sought the same refuge. "There we met the Duc de Bourbon. I saw for the first time, at this Chantilly, a prince who was not yet the last of the Condés." Did Chateaubriand recall that striking meeting of the three exiles when the news that Napoleon had executed this same young Duc d'Enghien induced in him one of his instantaneous changes of attitude and set him forever against the Corsican?

Fontanes took the exile to his own house on his arrival in Paris,

and then "took me to his friend, Joubert, where I found a temporary shelter." Through Joubert he was to be aided by the friendship of a woman, Madame de Beaumont, and to reap from her salon many benefits if not so much honor as he was later to garner from the more brilliant one of Madame Récamier. In much Chateaubriand was fortunate, though the plaintive note of the rain-dove is heard so constantly throughout his "Mémoires." Destiny for the moment was on his side. He could have had no better literary guides than these two friends, Fontanes and Joubert, who were also his severest critics. To-day one asks: Who is Joubert? Who de Fontanes? Sainte Beuve has a charming, beautifully sympathetic article on Joubert. He says "he was in his lifetime as little of an author as was possible; his life was entirely in his thoughts." Saint Beuve adds that Chateaubriand had in Fontanes and Joubert "two critics especially fitted to warn or guide him: Fontanes wholly protecting him, restraining him, at need defending him from all, covering him with his shield in the fight; Joubert stimulating and inspiring him, or murmuring gentle counsel. The best and most subtle criticism that exists on the early and great literary works of M. de Chateaubriand are contained in "The Letters and Thoughts of M. Joubert." M. Joubert said in a MS. found after his death: "I am like an Æolian harp which gives forth a few beautiful sounds and plays no tune." Mme. de Chastenay maintained that "he had the appearance of a soul which had met with a body by accident and put up with it as best he could."

Madame de Beaumont was also an aid, materially and morally, to Chateaubriand in his preparation of the "Génie du Christianisme" for publication. She was a delicate creature, the sole survivor of a family the Revolution had swept from the earth; "one of those pathetic beings who glide into life, leaving behind them a track of light," says Saint Beuve. "Her mind was quick, solid and elevated; her figure slender and aerial. It has been said of Madame de Beaumont that she loved merit as others loved beauty." It is not far to seek why Chateaubriand should have enlisted her deepest sympathy. Like herself, he was sorely bereft of near relatives by the guillotine of the Terror. When de Fontanes brought to her modest salon one spring evening in 1800 the unknown Breton exile she saw a slender man of thirty-two, of less than medium height, with well-set shoulders and a superb head, with the noble brow, curling black hair, eyes whose glances showed the depth as well as the color of the sea, and when he wished to please, with that smile of irresistible charm which Count Molé said was not to be found except in Chateaubriand and Bonaparte.

Chateaubriand got to work at once in the little *entre-sol* he had

taken in the Rue de Lille. "Not a soul knew of my 'Essai sur les Révolutions.'" While working on the "Génie du Christianisme" he had to do other work to keep the pot boiling, and wrote for the *Mercur de France*, which M. de Fontanes was editing. He had a pair of turtle doves (he was fond of pets and liked cats) which cooed so that he could not sleep one night. So he got up and wrote a most eloquent letter to Mme. de Staël for the *Mercur*. It concerned the views that lady had expressed in her recent work on literature. "This freak caused me suddenly to emerge from the shade; a few pages in a newspaper did what my two thick volumes on the Revolution had been unable to do. This first success seemed to foretell that which was to follow."

In correcting the proofs of "Atala," which like "René" was originally contained in the "Génie du Christianisme," he noticed some were missing. The fright he got over thinking some one had stolen his novel determined him to bring out "Atala" at once by itself. He did, and says: "The noise which I have made in this world dates from the publication of "Atala." My public career commenced." It was a striking novelty in literature of the period, both as to matter and treatment. It naturally excited much comment and discussion, especially among the academicians. Chateaubriand became the fashion, and was intoxicated with this first taste of fame. He received letters from impressionable young ladies, and their number increased after the publication of the "Genius of Christianity." As regards the latter, he says: "I am bound to say that, even though it were easy for me to take advantage of a passing illusion, my sincerity revolted against the idea of a voluptuousness that would have come to me by the chaste paths of religion; to be loved through the 'Génie du Christianisme,' loved for the *Extrême Onction*, loved for the *Fête des Morts*! I could never have been so shameful a Tartuffe."

"No! You never could, Chateaubriand," is the reader's hearty endorsement. With his intensity and his passion for revealing the very cells of his emotional feeling in these "Mémoires," had there been anything unworthy of an honorable man, nay, of a Christian, in his closest relations with women would it not have somehow appeared? It does not.

He thought he could nurse the sense of being a genius and a great writer in private. But de Fontanes introduced him to Napoleon's oldest sister, Eliza, Princess Bacciochi, and to his brother Lucien, a year or two later the Prince of Canino. He was also introduced at this time to Madame Récamier by Christian de Lamoignon. He adds here, rather strangely, "The curtain fell suddenly between her and me." Later, in Book XI. of the

"*Mémoires*," which is in its entirety a history and a panegyric of Madame Récamier, he says: "I cannot remember whether it was Christian de Lamoignon or the author of '*Corinne*' who introduced me to Madame Récamier, her friend. On emerging from my woods and the obscurity of my life I was still quite timid; I scarce dared lift my eyes to a woman surrounded by adorers." One month later when he was calling on Madame de Staël, who had helped to secure his erasure from the list of the proscribed, Madame Récamier entered. Chateaubriand could hardly stammer a word to Madame de Staël, who was conversing (?) eloquently; he was staring so eloquently at that radiant vision which had floated in upon them in a white gown and was now enthroned on a blue sofa. "Madame Récamier went out and I did not see her again till twelve years later." Nothing weakened their friendship after that till his death.

The modest salon of Madame de Beaumont was a great contrast to the distinguished one of Madame Récamier, but it was more distinctively literary. "Since when has my Council elected to hold its sessions at Madame Récamier's?" asked Napoleon. In the one the young writer was unfolding the glowing blossoms of his genius, amid the encouragement of friends who were valuable critics. In the other he was to receive homage as its principal feature and most honored celebrity, and this was to continue till his death. What a honeyed sweetness there should have been in many of Chateaubriand's melancholy recollections!

"*The Genius of Christianity*" was published, and "although the success of my big book was as brilliant as that of my little '*Atala*,' it was more widely contested. Madame de Staël, dipping into the uncut leaves of the volume and seeing the chapter entitled '*Virginity*,' uttered a wail. 'Our poor Chateaubriand! That will fall to the ground,' and the Abbé de Boulogne had told the publisher: 'If you want to ruin yourself, print that.'" Later he wrote a splendid eulogy of the book. They neither of them realized the timeliness of its appearance. The First Consul was pursuing his work of reparation and reorganization. He had to contend with the irreligion of the day and he wished to restore religion as a powerful element in reconstituting society. "What I want," he said, "is the old Catholic religion, the only one which is embedded in everybody's heart, and from which it has never been torn. This religion alone can conciliate hearts in my favor; it alone can smooth away all obstacles."

He recognized Chateaubriand as a useful ally, and appreciated the timeliness of the "*Génie du Christianisme*" as due to his lucky star.

Easter Sunday, April 18, 1802, the Concordat was solemnly pub-

lished in every quarter of Paris with blare of trumpet and rattle of drum. This festivity of joy and peace received its religious consecration by a magnificent ceremony in Notre Dame, whose portals were thrown open for an official cortège for the first time in twelve years. The Archbishop of Paris met the First Consul at the door to conduct him to a dais prepared for him before the altar, with the Senate, the Legislative Corps and the Tribunes ranged on either hand. Cardinal Caprara, Legate of the Holy See, officiated at the Mass, and two orchestras supplied the music, under the bâtons of Cherubini and Mehul. That very day the *Mercur* announced the "Génie du Christianisme," which appeared four days later, with the approval of Napoleon on the work, while its author in the preface discreetly conveyed his admiration for the ruler who had reopened the temples of the Christian faith and welcomed the Church back.

Writing in 1836, Chateaubriand says of this work so opportunely published thirty-four years before: "Now, supposing that my name leaves some trace behind it, I shall owe this to the 'Génie du Christianisme.' With no illusion as to the intrinsic value of the work, I admit that it possesses an accidental value; it came just at the right moment. For this reason it caused me to take my place in one of those historic periods which, mixing an individual with things, compel him to be remembered. If the influence of my work was not limited to the change which in the past forty years it has produced among the living generations; if it still served to resuscitate among late-comers a spark of the civilizing truths of the earth; if the slight symptom of life which one seems to perceive was there sustained in the generations to come, I should depart full of hope in the Divine mercy. O, reconciled Christian, do not forget me in thy prayers when I am gone; my faults, perhaps, will stop me outside those gates where my charity cried on thy behalf, 'Be ye lifted up, O eternal gates.'"

The October following the publication took Chateaubriand to Avignon, where they were selling pirated editions of his work. It also took him to Lyons, where he met the printer who, after M. Migneret, was the owner of the "Génie du Christianisme," Pierre Simon Ballanche, and they became life-long friends. The serene, beautiful character of this Christian man, Ballanche, entitles him to more admiration than do his notable books on Christian philosophy. He was one of the most ardent friends of Madame Récamier, one of the trinity which she especially cherished: Matthieu de Montmorency, Ballanche and Chateaubriand. Each of them was deeply religious. At least two of them deeply so.

Soon after the adoption of the Concordat Lucien Bonaparte gave

an entertainment in honor of the First Consul, to which Chateaubriand was invited "as having rallied the Christian forces and led them back to the charge." He had never seen Napoleon before except at a distance. "His smile," he says, "was beautiful and caressing; his eyes were admirable, owing especially to the manner in which they were placed beneath his forehead and framed in his eyebrows. There was as yet no charlatanism in his glance, nothing theatrical or affected. One single time, on the shore of the two worlds, I met the man of the last and the man of the new century: Washington and Napoleon. I conversed for a moment with each; both sent me back to solitude; the first through a kindly wish, the second through a crime."

Thanks to this interview, Napoleon appointed Chateaubriand first secretary to the French Embassy in Rome, to which he sent his mother's half-brother, Cardinal Fesch, as Minister. Chateaubriand refused the honor at first; then, through the entreaties of the Abbé Emery, of the Seminary of Saint Sulpice, accepted, "for the good of religion," although convinced he would be of little use. With superb self-appreciation he adds: "I am no good at all in the second rank."

What helped to persuade him was that his friend, Madame de Beaumont, now dying of lung trouble, was willing to try Italy for her health if he was to be there. They both went, and M. de Chateaubriand's clerical duties—"I had almost nothing to do. . . . I was happy when some funeral passed by for a change!"—did not prevent the most loyal devotion and ministrations to his dying friend, whose last sigh he received on the 4th of November, five months after his arrival in Rome. "One lamentable thought distracted me," he says when recounting this death bed. "I noticed that Madame de Beaumont had not until her last breath suspected the real attachment I bore for her." After she had received the last sacraments she talked for half an hour with her friend about his plans, urging him, above all, to live with Madame de Chateaubriand and M. Joubert. She was buried in the Church of San Luigi dei Francesi, and Chateaubriand erected a two thousand dollar marble monument to her there.

It was at Rome that he first conceived the plan of writing the memoirs of his life as a solace to his grief. He had been dissatisfied with his post, and Napoleon was not content with his fulfillment of its duties, thanks to Cardinal Fesch's representations. "Cardinal Fesch was no more of an accommodating superior than Chateaubriand was an easily-handled subordinate," says Sainte Beuve. Nevertheless, the Emperor created a place for him as Minister to the Valais, a Catholic republic in the Alps, and Mme. Bacciochi

sent him word through M. de Fontanes that "the first important Embassy available was reserved for him." Chateaubriand left for Paris January 21, 1804. Madame de Chateaubriand joined him there to accompany him to the Valais. His wife's complete loss of fortune made his reunion with her imperative, quite aside from Madame de Beaumont's wish.

On the 21st of March he went to the Tuileries to take leave of Napoleon, whom he had not seen since the reception at Lucien's. The change in the First Consul's appearance to something gloomy and terrible so repelled Chateaubriand that he avoided meeting him, and contenting himself with the conventional acquittal of his duty in merely presenting himself at the Tuileries, he hastened away. He remarked to friends at the Hotel de France on his return that "something strange must have happened to produce such a change in Napoleon." The something was the Duc d'Enghien and Talleyrand's attitude in the matter.

Two days later Chateaubriand rose early to visit a cypress tree in a garden at the corner of the Rue Plumet and the new Boulevard des Invalides. It had been planted by Madame de Beaumont as a child. After this sentimental adieu he was returning, when he heard cried on the streets the condemnation to death of "the man known as Louis Antoine Henri de Bourbon." It was almost like the tocsin of a new "Terror."

"This cry fell upon me like a thunderbolt; it changed my life as it changed Napoleon's. I returned home; I said to Mme. de Chateaubriand: 'The Duc d'Enghien has been shot.' I sat down at a table and began to write my resignation. Madame de Chateaubriand raised no objection. She was not blind to my danger. General Moreau and Georges Cadoudal were being prosecuted; the lion had tasted blood; this was not the moment to irritate him."

Chateaubriand alleged the serious ill health of his wife, just learned by him from her physicians, as his reason for resigning the Ministry to the Valais. But Napoleon understood and was furious. Through Mme. Bacciocchi's intercession no great evil consequences ensued, though Chateaubriand adds: "Till the day of his fall he held the sword suspended over my head. Sometimes he returned to me by a natural leaning; sometimes I was drawn to him by the admiration with which he inspired me, by the idea that I was assisting at a transformation of society, not at a mere change of dynasty; but antipathetic in so many respects, our respective natures gained the upper hand, and if he would have gladly had me shot, I should have felt no great compunction in killing him." For Chateaubriand, "the hero had changed himself into a murderer."

The whole following book deals with the case of the Duke d'Enghien, and was written at Chantilly. The wily Talleyrand's share in the miserable atrocity is strongly brought out. He begins with the assertion that "men dreaded a return to the days of Robespierre." Three years later allusions to this act of Napoleon's in an article in the *Mercure*, of which Chateaubriand was then the sole proprietor, caused the suppression of the paper and jeopardized Chateaubriand's liberty. "Does Chateaubriand think I am an idiot, that I don't understand him? I will have him cut down on the steps of the Tuileries," exclaimed Napoleon furiously. Yet Chateaubriand escaped arrest and was disposed to be more quiet for his wife's sake. But for the two or three years preceding this article his life was quiet and rather dull. Madame de Chateaubriand admired Bonaparte and cherished no illusions as to the Legitimacy. She would frequently predict to her husband what would happen to him if the Bourbons came back. She proposed travel, and they took some short journeys. They visited Mme. de Staël at Coppet, banished from Paris by Napoleon, and Chateaubriand envied her the luxurious exile she found so wearisome. They also visited the Grande Chartreuse and admired Le Sueur's frescoes.

At Villeneuve Chateaubriand had another sorrow. There is no doubt that his life was rich in them. He heard there of Lucile's death. Madame de Beaumont's passing had affected her mind. She had been living in a convent of the Dames Michel, brooding and writing extraordinary letters, grandiloquent and morbidly self-conscious, to her brother and to others. She was buried among the poor in an unknown grave! Chateaubriand did not even know where she died. "Lucile loved to hide herself; I have made her a solitude in my heart; she shall leave it only when I cease to live." He wrote to M. Chênedollé: "We have lost the most beautiful soul, the most exalted genius that ever existed." This is more than extravagant; it is irresponsible. However, one may allow for poignant brotherly affliction. Lucile's letters are conscious, almost pompous in their solemnity and wearisome in their egotistic humility and phrenetic affection. One may sympathize with Madame de Chateaubriand's sentiments in regard to her. "Still bruised by Lucile's imperious whims, Madame de Chateaubriand saw only a deliverance for the Christian who had gone to rest in the Lord. Let us be gentle if we would be regretted. The loftiness of genius and the higher qualities are mourned only by the angels." It must be confessed that there are times when the writer of these fascinating "Mémoires" loses the reader's sympathy for a moment by a bold touch of conceit, expressed with cheap floridity.

In 1806 Chateaubriand made his journey to the East, and on his return, in 1807, he bought the little property at the Vallée-aux-Loups for \$6,000, and spent as much more in embellishing it. Here he wrote "Les Martyrs, l'Itinéraire, le Dernier des Abencerrages" and began these "Mémoires." The Duke Mathieu de Montmorency bought it in 1816 for \$10,000, and it belongs still to his heir, M. le Duc de La Rochefoucauld-Doudeauville. It was offered for sale in 1889 for \$50,000, but did not find a purchaser. "The Vallée-aux-Loups is the only thing that I regret of all that I have lost; it is written that nothing shall remain to me," writes Chateaubriand in 1839, in Paris. "After the loss of my Valley I planted the *Infirmérie de Marie-Thérèse*, which also I have lately left."

On the death, on January 10, 1811, of Marie Joseph de Chénier, brother of the better known André de Chénier, whom Chateaubriand had helped to fame, Chateaubriand's friends wished him to succeed to his place in the Institute, as that body would be a protection to him. He was almost unanimously elected by the twenty-five members sitting on the 20th of February, 1811. He submitted the speech he was to deliver at his reception among the Academicians to the imperial censorship and received it back, heavily scored with Bonaparte's "blue pencil." Chateaubriand declared he would rather not be received than write another. The Minister of Police invited the recalcitrant author to try once more the air of Dieppe. There follow two rather quiet years. Then Chateaubriand came out with a political pamphlet which Louis XVIII. said was worth more than a hundred thousand men for the Restoration: "De Bonaparte et des Bourbons." It was published, as was the "Génie du Christianisme," most opportunely as far as concerned the cause Chateaubriand was interested in, viz: March 30, 1814. The Empire was crumbling after the superb Corsican had pocketed a good deal of Europe and had stuck crowns on the heads of most his family.

Chateaubriand's literary career is comprised between 1800-1813. His political career begins and Part Third of the "Mémoires," 1814-1830, sets forth that brilliant but less interesting period of his very full life. The last and concluding portion will be devoted to retirement and ruminations upon the past. Until he sinks into that modest tomb at the Grand Bè, Saint Malo, there will be something proud, sensitive and forceful about this Breton soul which had been swept along on such changing and violent currents of life. But this last decade of René, Vicomte de Chateaubriand, will be softened, illumined and guarded by the unwearying solicitude of the most beautiful woman in the world, who was also marvelously kind—Julie Récamier.

In the recapitulation at the end of Part Second, he writes, with

perfect truth in his judgment: "My life of poetry and erudition was really closed by the publication of my three great works, the 'Génie du Christianisme,' the 'Martyrs' and the 'Itinéraire.' My political writings began with the Restoration; with these writings also began my active political existence. Here, therefore, ends my literary career, properly so called. Not until this year, 1839, have I recalled the bygone times of 1800 to 1814. This literary career, as you have been free to convince yourselves, was no less disturbed than my career as a traveler and a soldier. There were also labors, encounters and blood in the arena; all was not muses and Castilian spring. My political career was even stormier." Chateaubriand writes this resumé of his career after he had entered on what Lescure calls "*la période crépusculaire de son existence*"—the twilight stage of his brilliantly colored life.

When the allies were fighting Napoleon Chateaubriand's high opinion of the genius of Bonaparte and the gallantry of French soldiers was such that he never dreamed of ultimate success for the invaders. He imagined that France would awaken to her danger from Napoleon's ambition and, by a movement from within, would enfranchise the French. If the political assemblies checked both these, that the people might know to whom to resort according to his mind, was set forth in his aggressive pamphlet, "De Bonaparte et des Bourbons." "The shelter seemed to me to lie in the authority, modified in accordance with the times, under which our ancestors had lived for eight centuries. When, in a storm, one finds nothing within reach but an old edifice, all in ruins though it be, one retires to it." He was not of those who believed that "the Bourbons never forgot anything and never learned anything." He prepared his brief both as a pamphlet and as a speech. When France arose he was ready to spring the latter on an assembly at the Hotel de Ville. Madame de Chateaubriand felt that the discovery of this pamphlet could only mean the scaffold for her husband. Chateaubriand used to take small pains to conceal the manuscript when he left the house, merely thrusting it under his pillow. As soon as he was gone his terrified wife hastened to secrete it on her person. Once after she had left the house she noticed that she had not the manuscript with her. She fainted in the Tuileries! She found it when she got home. "I never experienced such a moment of joy in my life," she says. "Certainly I can truthfully say that it would not have been so great had I seen myself released at the foot of the scaffold; for after all it was some one dearer to me than myself whom I saw released from it." Which simple but sincere avowal shows that the somewhat subordinate position Mme. de Chateaubriand occupies in her distinguished husband's "Mé-

moires" is no sign that she did not hold him in the highest esteem and affection.

"The allied army entered Paris on the 31st of March, 1814, ten days only after the anniversary of the death of the Duc d'Enghien, 21st of March, 1804. Was it worth Bonaparte's while to commit an action of such long remembrance for a reign which was to last so short a time?" asks Chateaubriand. Napoleon abdicated unconditionally on April 6. On the 20th he took leave of his guard at Fontainebleau. On the 4th of May he landed at Elba.

Louis XVIII. landed at Calais April 24, 1814, after twenty-three years of exile from his country and his throne, and resumed the French crown as his prerogative by birth. The Treaty of Paris between the allies and France was concluded on the 30th of May, 1814, and a general congress within two months at Vienna was determined on to settle final arrangements. Louis resumed things as a Bourbon. He "granted" the charter, dating his boon from the nineteenth year of his reign, considering Napoleon's as null and void. The sovereigns of Europe, who were at the very time in Paris, had all recognized Napoleon. Chateaubriand says: "That obsolete language and these pretensions of the ancient monarchies added nothing to the lawfulness of the right and were mere puerile anachronisms." Yet Louis XVIII. could become King of France only by his essential right to the crown, according to his way of thinking. Such right was inalienable and no matter what Napoleon had *seemed*, or what power he had wielded, he had never really been *King* of France. He, Louis, poor exile of Hartwell, had been its King all the while, howsoever his hands had been bound or his sway nullified. It was the logical point of view of Monarchy and of a Bourbon.

Louis XVIII. entered Paris May 3, 1814, the day before Napoleon disembarked at Elba. On the 19th of March, 1815, Louis XVIII. left Paris, and on the 20th Napoleon entered it, having returned from Elba. Chateaubriand comments on this move of Napoleon thus: "The boldness of the enterprise was unprecedented. From the political point of view this enterprise might be regarded as the irremissible crime and capital fault of Napoleon. He knew that the Princes, still assembled at the congress, that Europe, still under arms, would not suffer him to be reinstated; his judgment must have warned him that a success, if he obtained one, would be only for a day. He was offering up to his passion for reappearing on the scene the repose of a people which had lavished its blood and its treasures upon him. He was laying open to dismemberment the country from which he derived all that he had been in the past and all that he will be in the future. In this fantastic conception lay

a ferocious egotism and a terrible absence of gratitude and generosity towards France." This arraignment is no stronger, no clearer, than it is just.

Chateaubriand's voice in this moment of peril (?) was no undecided one. In a foot-note he says that M. de La Fayette in his "Memoirs," "confirms the singular conjunction of his opinion and mine on the occasion of Bonaparte's return," adding, "M. de La Fayette was a sincere lover of honor and liberty." Chateaubriand himself loved nothing more. He advocated the dispersion of the royal family while the King should remain in Paris. "Let us resist but three days and victory is ours. The King, defending himself in his palace, will arouse universal enthusiasm. Lastly, if he must die, let him die worthy of his rank; let Napoleon's last exploit be to cut an old man's throat. Louis XVIII. in sacrificing his life will win the only battle he will have fought; he will win it for the benefit of the freedom of the human race."

It is in portions like this of his "Mémoires" that the eloquence of Chateaubriand glows fiercely. Certainly in his scorn he has "winged words." How tersely and fierily he inveighs against the treachery of men at this moment. He scores Bonaparte; scorns Benjamin Constant; derides Marshal Soult; execrates Marshal Ney, and—"the King of France? Alas! He declared that at the age of 60 he could not better end his career than by dying in defense of his people . . . and fled to Ghent! At sight of this incapacity for truth in men's feelings, at the want of harmony between their words and their deeds, one feels seized with disgust for the human kind."

In the scamper that followed the King did not even notify of it those loyal henchmen "who, like myself," says Chateaubriand, "would have been shot within an hour after Napoleon's entry into Paris." At this juncture he met the Duc de Richelieu in the Champs-Élysées, and the Duke said: "They are deceiving us. I am keeping watch here, for I do not propose to await the Emperor at the Tuileries all by myself." Mme. de Chateaubriand kept watch on things, too, and hustled her husband into her carriage at four o'clock in the morning of March 20—that good man so wrathful that he neither knew nor cared where they were going.

Once again as a refugee Chateaubriand arrived at Brussels. No wonder he says, "I loathe the Brabant capital." He finds Louis XVIII. at Ghent and is made Minister of the Interior *ad interim*. The last words must have seemed eloquent. One consolation of these days was the Duchesse de Duras' friendship for him. *Apropos* of that Chateaubriand declared: "A man protects you through his worth, a woman through your worth; that is why, of those two empires, one is so hateful, the other so sweet."

The Bourbon King and his followers remained almost torpid in Ghent. One day Chateaubriand left that city at noon by the Brussels gate, to finish his walk (like most meditative beings he liked solitary strolls) on the highway. He read Cæsar's Commentaries as he slowly sauntered on, till a low rumbling caused him to look up at the sky. It was not rain. It was the magnificent death rattle of the artillery at the battle of Waterloo. He leaned against a poplar and his meditations were deeper and more gloomy. Each new burst of the cannon made his heart beat faster. A courier came riding up. To his feverish inquiry he received the assurance that Bonaparte was fighting, and that the Allies were supposed to have suffered defeat. There was another flurry at Ghent. Later reports declared that Bonaparte had lost the battle of Waterloo! Napoleon was the first to bring the news of it to Paris, where he reëntered the barriers on the night of the 21st. Again Napoleon abdicated; in favor of his son. Poor little King of Rome! "Napoleon le Grand et Napoleon le Petit."

When Louis XVIII. had returned to St. Denis and the cry was for Fouché, the Duc d'Otranto, as his Minister, Chateaubriand breaks forth: "I said my prayer at the entrance to the vault where I had seen Louis XVI. lowered; full of dread as to the future, I do not know that I ever felt my heart drowned in a more profound and more religious melancholy." Such a superlative in his case has indeed an appalling sound. Later he was waiting in an antechamber of the King's. "Suddenly a door opened; silently vice entered leaning on the arm of crime, M. de Talleyrand walking supported by M. Fouché; the infernal vision passed slowly before me, penetrated into the King's closet and vanished. Fouché was coming to swear fealty and homage to his lord; the trusty regicide on his knees laid the hands which caused the head to fall of Louis XVI. between the hands of the brother of the royal martyr; the apostate Bishop was surety for the oath." In its strength and daring and color Chateaubriand's language is at times more opulent and distinctive as a patriot than as a poet.

Before leaving Saint Denis Chateaubriand saw the King, who forced him to speak out what he thought of this move. "Sire, I obey your orders; pardon my loyalty. I think the monarchy is finished." He waited, trembling at his boldness, for a little, when the King said: "Well, M. de Chateaubriand, I am of your opinion."

"This conversation closes my history of the Hundred Days."

The following book concludes the third volume of the "*Mémoires*," and Chateaubriand devotes it to a study of Napoleon. He finds in the very treatment dealt out to him by the English an advantage for his glory. He says: "No man of universal fame-

has had an end similar to Napoleon's. He was not, as after his first fall, proclaimed autocrat of a few quarries of iron and marble, the first to furnish him with a sword, the second with a statue; an eagle, he was given a rock on the point of which he remained in the sunlight till his death, in full view of the whole world." This is a specimen of the splendid illumination of Chateaubriand's rhetoric. It does not stand cool analysis, but its resonant verve is a delight to the artistic imagination.

It is interesting right here to see what Napoleon had to say about Chateaubriand on that island rock of St. Helena. "If in 1814 and 1815 the royal confidence had not been placed in men whose souls were enervated by circumstances too strong for them, or who, renegades to their country, saw safety and glory for their master's throne only in the yoke of the Holy Alliance; if the Duc de Richelieu, whose ambition it was to deliver his country from the presence of foreign bayonets; if Chateaubriand, who had just rendered such eminent services at Ghent, had had the direction of affairs, France would have issued powerful and dreaded from those two great national crises. Chateaubriand has been gifted by nature with the Promethean fire; his works witness it. His style is not that of Racine, it is that of the Prophet. If ever he arrives at the helm of State it is possible that Chateaubriand may go astray; so many others have found their ruin there! But what is certain is that all that is great and national must be fitting to his genius, and that he would have indignantly rejected the ignominious acts of the then administration."

"Such were my last relations with Bonaparte," adds Chateaubriand. "Why should I not admit that that opinion tickles my heart's proud weakness? Many little men to whom I have rendered great services have not judged me so favorably as the giant whose might I have dared to attack."

III.

During his political career as well as during the Hundred Days, a characterization of Chateaubriand made by M. de Lescure, his excellent biographer, is proven true. He saw things large and men small. *Il voyait les choses en grand et les hommes en petit.* The charm of these "Mémoires" is in their personal revelation of Chateaubriand as a man, in his thoughts, his acts and his relations with others. They are the close and throbbing portrayal of a sensitive, poetic, high-spirited soul, saturated with the emotions of a long and varied existence, melancholy, ironic, but to the end vital and self-centered. His deeds as a politician, as a statesman, as a partisan

(he was never a courtier) may be passed lightly over, though his integrity, loyalty and strength, despite his capacity for swift change of front, are constantly evidenced. Chateaubriand is consistent from beginning to end, despite apparent swift and radical changes of position.

He was made a peer of France August 17, 1815. "I received at my entrance the only honor which my colleagues ever did me during my fifteen years' residence in their midst; I was appointed one of the four secretaries for the session of 1816. Lord Byron met with no more favor when he appeared in the House of Lords, and he left it for good. I should have returned to my deserts." The Restoration had made thought quicker and more bold. "Appalled at the systems which men were embracing and at France's ignorance of the principles of constitutional government, I wrote and had printed the '*Monarchie selon la Charte*.'" Chateaubriand was hostile to the Duke Decazes, whom the King had made his Minister. Like Fouché, he had once been head of the police. The noblest of the Faubourg Saint Germain flocked to his entertainments. Chateaubriand, a Frenchman, says this: "The Frenchman may do what he pleases, he will never be anything but a courtier, no matter of whom, provided it be a power of the day." The assassination of the Duke de Berry, the Comte d'Artois' eldest son, increased the ill-will against Decazes and brought about his fall. The Duke de Berry was killed by Louvel, "a little man with a dirty and sorry face, such as one sees by the thousand on the Paris streets," February 13, 1820. "M. le Duc de Bordeaux saw the light on the 29th of September, 1820. The Papal Nuncio, in his congratulatory address in the name of the Diplomatic Body styled the infant "the child of Europe," and Lamartine apostrophized him in an ode as "the child of miracle." It is this nephew of Louis XVIII., better known to our generation as the Comte de Chambord, who was the last Bourbon of the elder branch to be heir to the French crown. Later Chateaubriand, almost in his grave, took his tottering way to London to pay homage to him whom he recognized as his King.

Before that same King's birth Chateaubriand was to suffer (?) on his account. Three good market women of Bordeaux had a cradle made for the coming infant and chose M. le Vicomte de Chateaubriand to present it—and themselves! to Mme. la Duchesse de Berry. He promptly asked for a ceremonial audience for the worthy souls. M. le Comte de Sèze thought this honor should be his. Chateaubriand was out with the Ministry. It became an affair of State and got into the papers. Whereupon the gallant market ladies wrote to Chateaubriand that they were willing to

state "in the newspapers," if he would permit such a measure, that they had selected him for their introducer to royalty and the reason why, and this would "silence all tongues." Chateaubriand wrote them a nice, tactful letter, which no doubt they had framed, advising a dignified silence in the matter, and adding that he and Mme. de Chateaubriand "eat your chestnuts every day and talk of you." History makes no report of any disaffection toward Chateaubriand on the part of the market women of Bordeaux.

Decazes was compensated for his fall by the Ambassadorship at London, and the Duc de Richelieu succeeded him in France. Chateaubriand, as we know, was to succeed Decazes at London two years later, but he was at low ebb in fortune now. On September 20, 1816, he was stricken from the list of Ministers of State and lost the pension attached to it. "The hand which had taken Fouché had struck me." He was obliged to sell his library and his dear Vallée-aux-Loups. He secured from Richelieu for De Villèle and his staunch friend, de Corbière, positions on the Council, and he was appointed Minister to Berlin. In the Berlin *Morgenblatt* a titled "newspaper woman of the time thus describes Chateaubriand at his first court fête, at which the future Empress of Russia and the Duchess of Cumberland were his partners in a polonaise: "M. de Chateaubriand is of a somewhat short yet slender stature. His oval countenance has an expression of reverence and melancholy. He has black hair and eyes; the latter glow with the fire of his mind, which is pronounced in his features."

Chateaubriand returned to Paris April 27, 1821, to assist at the baptism of M. le Duc de Bordeaux, which occurred at Notre Dame May 1, and in the distribution of honors on that occasion was restored to the list of Ministers again. Villèle and Corbière resigned July 27, 1821, on the question of the censorship, and Chateaubriand tendered his resignation as Minister to Berlin through loyalty. There was a new shuffle, and he went to take Décazes' place in London. "Mme. de Chateaubriand, fearing the sea, dared not cross the Channel and I set out alone."

"All the English are mad by nature or by fashion," Chateaubriand writes nonchalantly in this book of his Embassy in London, but he had a very gay time with these same lunatics. We hear of dinners, Almacks and *le beau monde*. "The day was thus distributed in London: At 6 o'clock in the morning one hastened to a party of pleasure, consisting of a breakfast in the country; one returned to lunch in London; one changed one's dress to walk in Bond street or Hyde Park; one dressed again to dine at half-past 7; one dressed again for the opera; at midnight one dressed once more for an evening party or rout. What a life of enchantments! I should a

hundred times have preferred the galleys." One smiles, and reads on. He found London full of recollections of Bonaparte. "The people had passed from the vilification of 'Nick' to a stupid enthusiasm. His colossal bust by Canova decorated the Duke of Wellington's staircase."

Here is one of those touches which make his casual mention of persons entertaining. At an evening party at Lord Londonderry's, the English Premier, "I was presented by His Majesty to a severe-looking lady, seventy-three years old. She was dressed in crape, wore a black veil like a diadem on her white hair and resembled a Queen who had abdicated her throne. She greeted me in a solemn voice with three mangled sentences from the '*Génie du Christianisme*;' then she said to me, with no less solemnity: 'I am Mrs. Siddons.' If she had said to me, 'I am Lady Macbeth' I should have believed her."

The name and thought of Charlotte arise. He adds that she and a part of her family came to see him in France in 1823, when he was a Minister, and that "something may have been lacking in his voice," for she left a letter on parting which showed that she was hurt by his coldness. "If it were true that she had a genuine reason to complain I would fling into the fire all that I have told of my first sojourn across the sea," he writes. "Often the thought has come to me to go to solve my doubts; but could I return to England, I who am weak enough not to dare to visit the paternal rock on which I have marked out my tomb?" . . .

"God ordained differently, and I left for Verona; thence the change in my life, thence my ministry, the Spanish war, my triumph, my fall, soon followed by that of the monarchy."

This brief epitome may suffice. With what pride he speaks of the Congress of Verona and its consequences. "My Spanish war, the great political event of my life, was a gigantic undertaking." He meant to incorporate his history of it in his "*Mémoires*," but as it occupied four volumes he forebore to do so! According to the terms with the syndicate which had acquired the right of publishing his future works, this meant \$16,000 for him. But the protests of M. de la Ferronays (Ambassador to St. Petersburg) and M. Marcellus, who thought certain documents were published that should remain secret, he cut it down to two volumes, telling the gentlemen their scruples cost him \$8,000. It was still too long to embody in the "*Mémoires*." In this edition of the Putnams M. Edmond Biré, editor of the French edition, supplies an appendix on the Congress of Verona. The gap in the "*Mémoires*" is from October, 1822, to June, 1824. During that time the events occurred concisely enumerated above except the fall of the monarchy.

Yet it was then that the Spanish war took place, which was Chateaubriand's doing and which he rates as his proudest glory. His only recompense from it was disgrace. The Royal Family showed scant appreciation of his conduct of the affair, and the recompenses which followed it were the beginning of strained relations between Chateaubriand and the King, and M. de Villèle as well. Chateaubriand received decorations from the Kings of Prussia, Portugal, Sardinia, Spain and from the Czar Alexander, who alone among sovereigns was his personal friend. Later in his life he alludes to the casket containing these proud insignia as a box of worthless junk, which he would gladly dispose of for the most paltry consideration.

On June 6, 1824, he was curtly removed from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The loss of power was not more trying a blow than the affront which the dismissal was felt to be by him in its brusque ingratitude. He had certainly been a generous friend and loyal partisan of De Villèle, and the treatment accorded him by this man would have aroused the resentment of a far less chivalrous and sensitive soul than Chateaubriand's.

The *Journal des Débats* soon made clear that Chateaubriand in opposition was not to be despised and that he had its support. It had overthrown the Decazes ministry and that of Richelieu, and it also downed, as M. Bertin in his loyalty threatened to do, the Villèle ministry. M. de Villèle made himself so unpopular by his measures that in three years not parliamentary action, but a manifestation of the National Guard, prefaced his undoing.

Chateaubriand's vigorous aggressiveness in opposition was interrupted by the death of Louis XVIII., September 16, 1824, and he resumed it only after the coronation of Charles X., the King's brother, May 29, 1825. Chateaubriand's pamphlet "Le Roi est mort: vive le Roi" "performed for Charles X. what my pamphlet 'De Bonaparte et des Bourbons' had performed for Louis XVIII." After the King was crowned at Rheims Chateaubriand writes: "All my duties being fulfilled, I left Rheims and was able to say, like Joan of Arc, 'My mission is ended.'"

The National Guard had shouted "Down with Villèle" on the day of their review by Charles X., April 29, 1827. Villèle in his wrath induced the King to disband them. "A royal decree pronounced the disbanding, the most baleful blow struck at the monarchy before the last blow of the Days of July; if at that moment the National Guard had not been dissolved the barricades would not have gone forward," says Chateaubriand. Villèle was down and out by December 2, 1827. Chateaubriand was appointed successor to the Duc de Laval as Ambassador to Rome.

A memorandum on the political situation in France at that time (1828) which Chateaubriand sent to his friend, M. de la Ferronays, will interest those who love politics and find pleasure in studying this side of Chateaubriand's ability. With deftly assumed humility he says that whoever reads it in his "Mémoires" "will skip it close-legged, and I should do as much in the reader's place." Then from the interest which some episode in them, after the manner of Homer or Virgil, would arouse, he draws attention to the difference between "the merit and glory of a great writer and a great politician." One smiles sympathetically at the epithet and at his characterizing his memorandum as "this little diplomatic masterpiece." It is by no means certain that he is playfully sarcastic in either qualification. Mr. Teixeira de Mattos foot-notes it thus: "I am inclined to echo a foot-note by M. Edmond Biré, who says: 'The readers, I hope, will not skip a line of this memorandum, a masterpiece of logic and patriotism and, which is no detriment, a masterpiece of style. Chateaubriand has written no pages that do him more honor.'"

There is no ambiguity here, and it is true as French readers go. Others may doubtless skip the memorandum. It is a political document and lacks the human interest which attaches to Chateaubriand's political deeds and their consequences. Everything that is personal in Chateaubriand, even his faults, is full of charm. He is somewhat of an *enfant gâté* by love, his own and others; but he is a fascinating "spoiled child."

From the letters to Mme. Récamier, written while he was at the Embassy in Rome, here is one extract to prove how endearingly and effectingly Chateaubriand could show his heart to his angelic friend. The epithet does not seem excessive. This extract cannot but help to a just appreciation of the elevated friendship existing between this sensitive and gifted man and this woman, world famous for her beauty, yet lovelier in soul than in body:

"When shall I cease to waste on the high roads the days that were given to me to make a better use of? I have spent with my eyes shut while I was rich; I thought the treasure inexhaustible. Now, when I see how it has diminished and how little time is left to me to lay at your feet, I feel a pain at my heart. But is there not a long existence after that on earth? A poor, humble Christian, I tremble before Michael Angelo's 'Last Judgment.' I know not where I shall go, but wherever you are not I shall be very unhappy. I have a hundred times acquainted you with my plans and my future. Ruins, health, the loss of all illusion, all say to me: 'Go away, retire, have done.' You wished me to mark my stay in Rome; it is done. Poussin's tomb will remain. It will bear this inscription:

F. A. de Ch. to Nicolas Poussin,
for the glory of Art and the honor of France.

"What more have I to do here now? Nothing, especially after subscribing your name for the sum of one hundred ducats to the monument of the man whom you say you love best 'after myself'—Tasso."

There is a love letter a Christian may roll under his tongue. It is to a woman "whose memory was as good as her heart." "The costly monument to Poussin was erected entirely at Chateaubriand's expense," says Biré, "and was only completed three years after this letter. At that time he had renounced all titles and emoluments and was penniless. It took him four years from 1831 to clear himself of debt to the artist, who was not much richer than himself."

Pope Leo XII. died February 10, 1829, at 9 in the morning. On August 8 of the same year a new ministry was formed, and despite De Polignac's endeavor to retain his support, Chateaubriand resigned the Roman Embassy, from which he had hoped so much. The next great event was the Revolution of July and Louis-Philippe, the "Citizen King." It was the end of the Bourbons, and Chateaubriand retired. His public life is ended forever. He will still find much to occupy him in his loyalty to the scattered Bourbons, who had treated him so poorly: the Duchesse de Berry and her son, the Duc de Bordeaux, the Dauphin after the abdication of Charles X. and of her younger son, the Duc d'Angoulême. Louis-Philippe, smug "trimmer" on a throne, tried in vain to interest Chateaubriand.

"Philip is a policeman," he says with vitriolic placidity. "Europe can spit in his face; he wipes himself, gives thanks and shows his patent as a King. The degradation of the elected head constitutes his strength. We obey a power which we believe ourselves to have the right to insult; that is all the liberty we require. On our knees as a nation, we slap our master's face, reëstablishing privilege at his feet, equality on his cheek. . . . This reign of Louis-Philippe's, however long it last, will always be an anomaly. . . . It is this abolition (of royalty), and not any individual chastisement, that will become the expiation of the death of Louis XVI.; none will be admitted to gird on the diadem after that just man: as witness Napoleon the Great and Charles X. the Pious. To render the crown completely hateful, it will have been permitted to the son of the regicide to stretch himself for a moment, as a false King, in the blood-stained bed of the martyr." Enough for Louis-Philippe and the "*juste-milieu*!"

Whatever is lacking in Chateaubriand, it is not clearness and courage in stating his views or energy in living up to them. Nothing will ever shake his loyalty to his young King, "Henry V." Surely his life had its fill of Revolutions. Even on the day before his death the clamor of one will fall upon his ears and he "wishes to go and see it," but he must remain in bed to die.

He improved his leisure by preparing a complete edition of his works. But he was called forth to burn his last cartridges, as occasion offered, against the usurper, himself a Chonan of the Opposition to the end.

After two years of straitened means Chateaubriand received from Charles X. \$4,000 for the two years' salary as Peer which he had forfeited by declining anything from Louis-Philippe, and he was enabled to leave Paris and travel. Visits to other victims of misfortune were among his diversions. He went to Armand Carrel, in his prison, and assumed the care of his crossless grave. Also he visited l'Abbé de la Mennais, the "M. Féli" of young Maurice de Guérin, and the two diminutive Saint Malo greatnesses—Chateaubriand's five feet four inches quite overtopped the other, who was a positive dwarf—met in the same prison of Sainte Pelagie, where Carrel had been thrown. Again, a more distinguished unfortunate claims a visit, the Comtesse de Saint Leu, once Queen of Holland, daughter of Josephine, wife of Louis Napoleon and mother of Napoleon III., when she was in the Chateau d'Arenenberg. From this he returns to hear of the imprisonment at Blaye of the mother of his "young King," and pours forth his plea for her in the "Mémorial on the Captivity of the Duchess of Berry."

In 1833 he received from the hands of the same Duchess a delicate mission, his last Embassy—to go to Charles X., her father-in-law, announce her marriage to Count Lucchesi-Palli and secure her against loss of her title, rank or maternal influence over her children. Poor Chateaubriand! "Bourbon through honor, Royalist by reason and conviction, Republican by taste and character."

He was also experiencing another sadness. He had created the romantic school and for long was its solitary star. But now Victor Hugo, Lamartine, Mme. George Sand and other literary lights were shining with great distinction in its firmament. He could well be concerned about his "Mémoires," which were to speak with his own voice—how eloquently!—to generations unborn and fix his fame with them. It is his work that will always live. The twilight of his existence had come, and life was henceforth to be divided between the Infirmerie Marie Thérèse and l'Abbaye-aux-Bois.

The latter, a convent of the Rue de Sévres in the Faubourg St. Germain, offered to Mme. Récamier after her reverses a small room

on the third floor. Could there be greater proof of the wonderful charm of this beautiful woman than was afforded by the throng of distinguished men and women whom she attracted there, who toiled up the hard stairway to the third floor like pilgrims to a shrine. In the days of her youth and wealth, with her superb establishment in the Rue de Mont-Blanc, to-day the Chaussée d'Autin, and her villa at Clichy, it was small wonder that her salon was the most brilliant one of the Empire, or that Fouché, at the instance of Napoleon, should have sought in vain to attach her to the court. Napoleon himself had been known to scowl at the radiant Juliette as he marked her beauty draw the attention of the people from his small but imperial self. Lucien, his brother, was desperately, fatuously in love with her. Prince Augustus of Prussia, nephew of Frederick the Great, besought her to divorce her husband and become his wife. M. Récamier was almost thirty years her senior, a father rather than husband, and she had married him when she was fifteen. Yet that she should have seriously considered taking this step in regard to a man who was more than indulgent stands as the nearest approach to a blemish which her character ever knew. That he met the proposal with such grave assent, together with his loss of fortune at this time, caused the tender-hearted woman to repent of any such purpose, and Prince Augustus was firmly dismissed. He carried her in his heart until death. Benjamin Constant was passionately devoted to her, and the letters of this prominent man of the times were so intense that his descendants have stoutly protested against their publication. Then there was the grave, clean-hearted, dog-like fidelity of Ballanche until his passing, with Madame Récamier weeping at his side. Mathieu de Montmorency, in name, character and ability of the highest nobility in France, said smilingly: "Three generations of the Montmorency family have passed under the yoke. We are all wounded, but we do not all die." Bernadotte, later King of Sweden, wrote her: "Amid the lustre which surrounds you and which you deserve by such manifold rights, deign sometimes to remember that the being most devoted to you in nature is Bernadotte." General Masséna on leaving for the army in Italy begged Mme. Récamier for a white ribbon from her gown. Later he wrote: "The charming ribbon given him by Mme. Récamier was worn by General Masséna in the battles and the blockade of Genoa; it never left the general and constantly promoted his victory." The signature of the "Iron Duke" is attached to this note: "I confess, madame, that I do not much regret that business will prevent me from calling on you after dinner, because every time I see you I leave you more impressed with your charms and less disposed to give my attention to

politics!!! I will call on you to-morrow on my return from the Abbé Sicard's, in case you should be in, and in spite of the effects which those dangerous visits produce on me. Your most faithful servant, Wellington."

Sainte Beuve, who touched on the last but not least brilliant period of the salon of the Abbaye-aux-Bois, was evidently as fascinated as the others by this innocent Circe, whose magic did not turn men into swine, but changed distinguished lovers into life-long friends. His essay on Mme. Récamier in the "*Causeries de Lundi*" proves this. He asks if Madame Récamier ever loved? "the chief and almost only question to be put in speaking of a woman. I boldly reply: *No.*" He then states that "the need of loving belonging to every tender spirit became with her an infinite need of being loved, and a fervent wish to repay those who loved her by kindness. She always remained pure, but always preserved the desire of conquest and the gentle skill of winning hearts—let us say the word, her coquetry; but (may orthodox doctors forgive the expression) it was a coquetry of the angels."

There is not room to speak of her women friends, since we are dealing only with the ideal relation which existed between a man of rare genius and sympathetic soul and a woman of entrancing loveliness, rather of soul than of body toward its last most consoling years, though Mme. Récamier preserved her physical charm almost to the end. Yet among those of her own sex who held her as a dear friend may be mentioned first Mme. de Staël, then Caroline Murat, Queen of Naples, Queen Hortense, Mme. Moreau and many others.

Chateaubriand describes that modest room in the Abbaye-aux-Bois, with its stone flooring and narrow, difficult stairway. "A dark corridor separated two small rooms. The bed room was furnished with a library, a harp, a piano, a portrait of Mme. de Staël and a view of Coppet by moonlight; pots of flowers adorned the window sills. When, quite breathless with clambering up three flights of stairs, I entered the cell at the fall of evening, I was enraptured. The outlook from the windows was over the garden of the Abbaye, in the green clumps of which the nuns moved to and fro and school girls ran hither and thither. The top of an acacia tree rose to the level of the window. Sharp-pointed steeples pierced the sky, and on the horizon appeared the hills of Sèvres. The expiring sun gilded the picture and entered through the open windows. Mme. Récamier sat at her piano; the Angelus tolled; the sound of the bell, which seemed 'to weep the dying day,' mingled with the last accents of the invocation of the night in Steibelt's 'Romeo and Juliet.' A few birds came to nestle in the raised outer blinds. I

joined the silence and solitude from afar, above the noise and tumult of a great city. God, by giving me those hours of peace, indemnified me for my hours of trouble. I foresaw the coming rest which my faith believes in and my hope invokes. I recovered my calm beside a woman who spread serenity around her. As I draw near my end it seems to me that all has been dear to me in Mme. Récamier, and that she was the hidden source of my affections."

Thus wrote Chateaubriand in Paris nine years before his death and twenty years after Mme. Récamier had retired to that little room in the Abbaye. Later the death of the Duchess of Montmirail, mother-in-law of the Duc de Doudeauville, enabled her to enjoy the large apartment on the first floor thus vacated. There she was better able to conciliate moderate means and the remarkable political, literary and social influence of the most frequented salon in Paris. Political up to 1828, her friends were to be found in high state positions and in the Embassies, although so far from seeking to sway or affect politics through them, mercy or pardon for culprits was all she ever sought to obtain.

From 1828 her salon became almost exclusively literary and academic, and Chateaubriand was King there. Mme. Récamier entered on her last phase of empire, that which she exercised over the old age of Renè, world-weary, dissatisfied with all things, even himself. "It was the one aim of her life," says Mme. Lenormand, the niece whom she had adopted, "to appease the irritability, soothe the susceptibilities and remove the annoyances of this noble, generous, but selfish nature, spoiled by excessive adulation." It should in justice be added that Chateaubriand's admirable devotion to Mme. Récamier was not merely to seek assuagement of his own ills. His homage to her, who, as M. de Monlosier remarked, could say, "Five hundred of my friends," was unremitting and intense.

Sainte Beuve (in reading his searching appreciation of the lady it does not argue a light, suspicious nature to believe that he fell as notably under the charm as did more distinguished victims) says: "During the last twenty years M. de Chateaubriand was the centre of her world, the great interest of her life, to which I will not say she sacrificed all the rest—she only sacrificed herself—but to which she subordinated everything. That he had his antipathies, aversions and even afflictions is sufficiently proved by the 'Memoirs Beyond the Tomb.' She tempered and corrected all that."

Readings from the "Mémoires" were a notable literary feature of the Abbaye. A collection of articles upon them based on these readings and with some extracts enabled Chateaubriand, in 1836, "obliged," he said, "to hypothecate his tomb in order to live," to sell his "Mémoires" for publication after his death. He obtained for

them a life pension of \$4,000 for himself, convertible to one of \$2,400 for his wife. After thus arranging for himself with posterity, he made provision for his last earthly lodging, "six feet of blessed earth" on the rock of Grand Bé, at Saint Malo.

Every day Chateaubriand wrote early in the morning to Mme. Récamier, just as, Ambassador at Rome, not a day passed without a letter to his absent friend. Every afternoon at 3 o'clock he went to see her. He said jokingly that "his regularity was such that people on the Rue de Sèvres set their watches as they saw him pass." This privileged honor was his alone. Rarely and with his permission some others were admitted. After dinner was for the rest, Mathieu de Montmorency arriving late, as his court services on Madame retained him at the Tuileries.

About the middle of 1846 Mme. Récamier was afflicted with a cataract, which gradually ruined her sight. About this time, too, an accident led to partial paralysis for René. Half-buried, then, before his complete descent into the tomb, his fiery and opinionated soul flamed strongly still. Mme. Mohl remarks on "his beautiful white silky hair blown about by a cold wintry wind as he watched the doctor coming from Mme. Récamier in the Abbaye." He would come in his carriage and be helped to his seat in the corner before any one arrived. There he sat listening, grave, possibly saturnine in his reserve, some ironic remark or keen question falling now and then from his lips. Chateaubriand had asked of God the grace of dying before his friend. She was the only close friend in his long life he was to predecease. Ballanche had prayed for the same favor. Both obtained it.

Mme. de Chateaubriand "fell softly asleep in the Lord" in February, 1847, as if to show the way to heaven to her husband. Ballanche followed soon after by an equally edifying death. It was at his death bed that Mme. Récamier destroyed any hope for her beautiful eyes by her intense weeping.

After his wife's death Chateaubriand wished Mme. Récamier to consecrate their long friendship by becoming his spouse. She most gently, most tenderly declined the honor. Her motive was still that of the most thoughtful friendship. She believed that his daily call on her supplied an incident in his life which alone interrupted its eventless routine.

One year after Ballanche's death Chateaubriand died, July 4, 1848. The cannon of the June Revolution sent their baleful thunders into his death chamber, and recalled the Archbishop of Paris, Mgr. Affre, shot a week before. He had seen the overthrow of Louis-Philippe. On the 2d of July he received the Viaticum, not only in full and perfect consciousness, but also with a profound sense of faith and

humility. The next day he dictated these lines to Geoffroy-Louis de Chateaubriand, his nephew: "I declare before God that I retract all that my writings may contain that is contrary to faith, morals and, generally, to the principles preservative of goodness." It was signed for him by his nephew.

When it was written he made them read it to him, then insisted on reading it with his own eyes. He resigned himself entirely to the act of dying and passed away the next morning at 8 o'clock to the rumbling of the cannon. There were at his bedside the Abbé Deguerry, rector of Saint Eustache, who was shot under the Commune as a hostage; his nephew, a Sister of Charity and Mme. Récamier. The last named, who survived him only a year, died of the cholera, a malady for which she had ever entertained the liveliest fear.

A funeral service was held in the Church of Foreign Missions, quite near Chateaubriand's house in the Rue du Bac. A solemn state funeral took place at Saint Malo on the 18th of July. The Mass was celebrated by the rector of Combourg and at the elevation the musicians played the air to which Chateaubriand had written his well-known lines:

Combien j'ai douce souvenance
Du joli lieu de ma naissance.
"I know no sweeter place on earth
Than the fair spot that gave me birth."

The procession of surpliced priests and the National Guards, with fluttering banners and glittering helmets, bore him then to the Grand Bé, the cannon thundering at intervals. M. Jean Jacques Ampère represented the French Academy. An innumerable crowd covered the ramparts and the reefs and rocks were black with figures. There was a squall as the sailors shouldered the coffin and bore it to the tomb. Then it suddenly calmed as they laid it into the grave. Peace had come to René in the spot which had seen his birth. Brittany and religion had given a magnificent burial to the neglected little boy who used to brood on Saint Malo's shore and who later wrote the "Genius of Christianity."

There he lies to-day, under a simple stone surmounted with a cross of granite and surrounded by an iron railing. No name, no inscription, no date. It was his own request. "The cross will tell that the man resting at its foot was a Christian; that will be enough for my memory."

His captivating record of his life, throbbing with the beauty, the melancholy, the fire, the loyalty of his strange soul, make the "Mémoires d' Outre Tombe" his greatest monument. "That will live forever," as Pierre Louÿs said to deMattos. Much has been said

and written by so many about Chateaubriand, about his merit and his influence. It is not necessary to make a summary of them. This autobiography contains him entire. "These 'Mémoires,'" says Sainte Beuve, "are, after all, his great work, that in which he reveals himself in all his egoistic nudity and also in his great talent as a writer."

This is why, save for occasional comment, which was little more than sharing a pleasing confidence with the reader, the writer of this article has been concerned to set him forth only as he presents himself. One cannot read these wonderful pages, through which a human life pours in such a brimming and richly colored sweep, without forming better acquaintance with Chateaubriand from himself than from a host of others who seek to appraise him. The personal temperament of the reader will have no little force in determining the regard awakened by them for Chateaubriand the man, whose voice breathes to him still from that lonely grave of the Grand Bé at Saint Malo. Characters the most varying held him in warm esteem in life, just as critics of the deepest insight and strongest judgment have widely differed in rating his artistic worth. Of this there is no question—that he was one of the most brilliant lights in the literary firmament of France in the nineteenth century, inaugurating the romantic school and influencing even to this day writers whose trend is along the way he blazed in a virgin woodland. He will never die in the memory of any refined soul who learns to know him in these glowing, superb "*Mémoires d' Outre Tombe*." Tolle, lege.

"No one remembers the speeches which we made round the table of Prince Metternich," Chateaubriand says on revisiting Verona in 1833, and calling the death roll of sovereigns who had participated in the Congress there in 1822, "but O! power of Genius, no traveler will ever hear the lark sing in the fields of Verona without recalling Shakespeare." There was solace in the thought and implied prophesy.

JOHN J. A'BECKET.

New York, N. Y.

MARTIN WALDSEEMÜLLER (ILACOMILUS).

D'Avezac, Marie Pascal, *Martin Hylacomylus Waldseemüller, ses ouvrages, et ses collaborateurs*, 8vo., Paris, 1867.

Fischer, Joseph, S. J., and Franz von Wieser; *The World-maps of Martin Waldseemüller (Ilacomilus) folio*, Innsbruck, 1903.

Ruge, Sophus, *Die Entwicklung der Kartographie von Amerika, 1500-1570* —Ergänzungsheft, No. 106, of *Petermann's Mittheilungen*, 4to, Gotha, 1892.

IN THE year 1490, two years before Columbus reached San Salvador, a young lad some ten or fifteen years old was entered as a student at the University of Freiburg in what is now the Grand Duchy of Baden, as Martin Waldseemüller,¹ son of a citizen of Freiburg.² This little lad, born and educated in a small German town, who as far as we know never saw the sea, and surely never crossed the ocean, was destined to give the name of America to the New World. The injustice done thereby to Christopher Columbus was wholly unintentional; Waldseemüller even attempted to correct his error; but man's actions, once they are consummated, are out of his control; and as Columbus found the western continent when he sought the Indies, so Waldseemüller when he sought to honor the discoverer of the New World robbed him of his well-merited honors.

Of Waldseemüller's life at Freiburg, of his family circumstances, of his career at the university we know very little. We can only conjecture that his purpose in studying there was to become a priest, for he died as canon of St. Dié, and that he did not waste his time, for he became a learned scholar. From the morning that we saw his father take him to the rector of the university we catch not even a glimpse of him until we find him fifteen years later a member of the Gymnasium Vosagense at St. Dié, in Lorraine. This Gymnasium Vosagense was a so-called collegiate chapter or community of canons who taught young men the branches now taught in a German gymnasium or in an old-fashioned American college. The Gymnasium Vosagense was the outgrowth of a monastery founded by St. Deodatus, Bishop of Nevers, in the seventh century under the Benedictine rule, as modified by the Irish Saint Columbanus. The wars and invasions of the tenth century caused the decay of the old monastery, which was turned into a collegiate chapter of canons, with a grand provost at their head. The grand provost, like his predecessors, the abbots, wore the mitre and car-

¹ Waldseemüller, not Waltzemüller, is the spelling uniformly employed by the Freiburg cartographer himself.

² This date is proved by the records of the University, as communicated by Rector Schreiber to Alexander von Humboldt.

ried the crosier. To protect the old monastery amid the disorders of the time the chapter fortified it. Gradually a village grew up around the stronghold (twelfth century) and received the name of the holy Bishop who had built the monastery, St. Deodatus, modernized into St. Dié.³

Such was the place where, in 1505, we find young Waldseemüller at the age of perhaps thirty or thirty-five. He was one of the savants attached to the gymnasium, of which the leading spirit was Walter Lud, some time secretary of Duke René II. of Lorraine, and a man interested in geography and science. Among his colleagues we find the Canon Jean Basin of Sendacour, the author of a book on rhetoric, reputed an elegant Latinist, and Mathias Ringmann, otherwise Philesius, a young scholar, who was credited with being somewhat of a Latin poet. He was even younger than Waldseemüller, being then twenty-three years of age, and was his closest friend.

About this time there was a marked revival of geography in central Europe. It centred wholly about the old geographer Ptolemy, who taught at Alexandria in Egypt about 150 A. D. Geography had been a lost science, it may be said, when about 1300 A. D. some of the Greeks exiled by the inroads of the Moslems brought a copy of Ptolemy to Italy. Thence it spread rapidly to Belgium, France and Germany. At Ulm, a town of Bavaria, two new editions of Ptolemy's work had been printed in the years 1582 and 1584. At Nuremberg John Müller, called Regiomontanus, was an authority on astronomy and geography, and Martin Behaim about the same time constructed the famous terrestrial globe, still in existence, which Columbus is said to have studied before sailing on his fateful first voyage. Geography and Ptolemy attracted the attention of southwestern German scholars in general. No wonder, therefore, that our friends of St. Dié also were seized by geographical enthusiasm and determined to publish a new edition of Ptolemy. For Lud was well versed in the science, as appears from his treatise on geography entitled "*Speculi Orbis Declaratio*," which he published at Strassburg in the year 1507.⁴ Ringmann appears to have been fond of literature and science in every form, while Waldseemüller was not only an authority on Ptolemy, but a practical designer of maps. He it was who was to prepare the maps for the new edition of Ptolemy. Ringmann's share of the work was the correction of the Latin text of the maps, *i. e.*, the determination of the proper Latin for the Greek names. Lud undertook to install a printing press at St. Dié and pay for the cost of the Ptolemy.

³ St. Dié had 10,000 inhabitants in 1867, and was an Episcopal See.

⁴ The printer was John Grüninger.

Behind these men stood the Duke of Lorraine, René II., the friend and patron of Walter Lud. Not that the Duke was a financial auxiliary, for Lud had pledged himself to provide the needed money. But René, owing to his influence, was able to procure for his *protégés* new information and new books as well as the coöperation of other men of learning.

Among the material thus procured by the Duke of Lorraine were some Portuguese marine maps exhibiting the progress of discovery on the eastern coast of South America and a manuscript copy of Vespucci's "Four Voyages" in French. Both came from Lisbon. Father Fischer, the learned Jesuit who discovered the famous Waldseemüller map, and Franz von Wieser have proved that the map placed by Duke René at the disposal of the geographer of St. Dié was the Canerio map now in the archives of the Service Hydrographique de la Marine at Paris. This map, they think, is based in part on information due to Amerigo Vespucci, and in this they agree with the German geographer Sophus Ruge.⁵ How the Duke of Lorraine became possessed of these precious documents we do not know. We do know, however, that in 1505 Mathias Ringmann published a translation of Vespucci's letter to Lorenzo di Pier Francesco dei Medici, the nephew of the great Lorenzo, and that this letter had been translated from Italian into Latin by Fra Giovanni Giocondo.⁶ The letter to dei Medici, howsoever it fell into Ringmann's hands,⁷ must have produced a profound impression on him and his friends, and it was probably at their request that Duke René wrote to Lisbon for further information. Vespucci was there at this very time, and he may well have furnished the information laid down in Canerio's map. As we know that the copy of Vespucci's "Four Voyages" was in French, it is not safe to connect it directly with the Florentine geographers.

At all events Waldseemüller and his friends were deeply impressed by the story of the new discoveries, as told in the letter to Lorenzo dei Medici and the "Four Voyages." This is clear from Waldseemüller's later proceedings. For while early in 1507 Lud still speaks of printing the Ptolemy, the geographers of St. Dié soon after seem to have put off indefinitely the publication of the projected edition

⁵ Cf. *Entwicklung der Kartographie von Amerika*, *Ergänzungsheft* of *Petermann's nautulung*, No. 106, p. 37.

⁶ Fra Giovanni Giocondo was a native of Verona. He was employed as an architect and engineer at Venice. In 1499 he came to Paris, where he was the architect employed by the city to build two bridges over the Seine, the New Bridge and the Notre Dame Bridge. It seems more than likely that he was a kinsman of Giuliano del Giocondo, son of Bartolomeo, who induced Amerigo to enter the Portuguese service in 1503.

⁷ In his dedication to his friend, Jacob Braun, Ringmann tells us that he came upon it by chance.

of Ptolemy for reasons we cannot now divine. We infer this from a passage in Walter Lud's treatise entitled "Explanation of the Mirror of the World," published by John Reinhart of Grüningen, usually called John Grüninger, a printer of Strassburg. It is found on leaflet iii. of the work, which consists of eight leaflets. We translate:

"We shall not deny that beyond Europe may be properly placed the map hastily prepared by us of the unknown country found both before and since the preparation of this Mirror of the World by the King of Portugal. On this country the reader may find fuller and more correct information in the Ptolemy edition by us and Martin Ilacomylus, a man most learned in matters of this kind, with many additions (which Ptolemy, with the help of Christ, we shall soon print). A description of these lands, in the French language, sent from Portugal to you, most illustrious King René, Jean Basin of Sendacour, a distinguished scholar, translated [into Latin] at my request, with his well-known elegance, and booksellers generally offer for sale an epigram of our friend Philesius Vosigena [Ringmann], printed in the pamphlet of Americus Vespucius, translated from the Italian into Latin by Jocundus of Verona, who holds the office of architect in Venice. This epigram I have subjoined."⁸

In fact the Ptolemy was not published till 1513. But Waldseemüller could not reconcile himself to postponing the publication of what he considered the greatest and most important improvement on Ptolemy's work, the outline of the new Spanish and Portuguese discoveries. He resolved to design a globe and a large planisphere, exhibiting an outline of the New World, as, following the example of Vespucci, he called the recently found countries. The globe, as he himself tells us, was on a modest scale, but to the map he gave larger proportions, indeed proportions so gigantic that they excite our admiration even to-day. Possibly this map was perhaps the first wall map ever published. It was certainly one of the first.

Up to this time, outside of the marine maps carried for practical purposes by navigators, cartography had been mainly occupied with repeated editions of Ptolemy, all of which contained a treatise explaining the construction of the maps, the symbols employed, the improvements and innovations made. Could Waldseemüller send out his world-map without a word of explanation? Assuredly not. Accordingly he prepared a little work, the title of which sets forth, at least in part, its nature. It is as follows: "*Cosmographiae Introductio cum quibusdam Geometriae ac Astronomiae principiis ad eam rem necessariis. Insuper quatuor Americi Vespucii navigationes.*" "Introduction to the World Map, with the principles of geometry

⁸ D'Avezac, Martin Waldseemüller, p. 60.

and astronomy necessary for its understanding. Besides the Four Voyages of Americus Vespucius."

This treatise was ready for the printer in the spring of 1507. Meantime Walter Lud had installed at St. Dié a printing press. From the letters G. L., N. L. and M. I. found as a printer's mark on the last page of the *Cosmographiae Introductio* it is fair to infer that Martin Ilacomilus [Waldseemüller] was at the time of its publication associated with Walter Lud [G. L.] and his kinsman, Nicolas Lud [N. L.], in the printing business. On the seventh day before the Kalends of May, *i. e.*, on the 25th of April, 1507, the *Cosmographiae Introductio* was published at St. Dié and dedicated to the Emperor Maximilian I. by Martin Waldseemüller. The author speaks in the first person singular throughout the entire dedication, in which he recommends himself to the Emperor and declares that "under his ægis, so to say, as under the shield of Achilles, he should be safe from the intrigues of his rivals." After the appearance of the *Cosmographiae Introductio*, in February, 1508, the Freiburg geographer left St. Dié on a visit to Germany.⁹ At Strassburg he wrote a letter to his friend Ringmann, now professor of cosmography at Basel, declaring that certain persons had sought to rob him of the credit due to him as the author of the map. Nowhere in his published writings does he mention the names of his rivals as he calls them in the dedication to Maximilian, but we have the means of solving the problem. The edition of the *Cosmographiae Introductio* issued on the 25th of April¹⁰ was followed by two other editions in the same year. The first of these editions must have been issued very soon after the original edition. Indeed, it is the original edition reprinted, with only four pages changed. The purpose of the change is plain. Every allusion to the authorship of Waldseemüller is effaced in the dedication as well as in

⁹ We translate the passages. "Martin Ilacomilus, of Friburg, sends greeting to his friend Phllesius (Ringmann)). When, during these carnival days, in order to console myself, I had to come to Germany from France, or rather from the town in the Vosges called St. Dié, where, as you know, principally under my guidance and through my exertions, although others falsely claim it for themselves, we have recently composed, designed and printed a picture of the world, both in the form of a globe, as also in the form of a map, which was circulated throughout the world, not without credit and glory to us. I . . ." This letter appears in the third Strassburg edition, published in 1508 by John Grüniger, of Prior Gregory Reisch's "Margarita Philosophica," a kind of primitive encyclopædia. For the third edition of Grüniger's Waldseemüller wrote an article extending over fourteen leaves, under the title "Architecturæ et Perspectivæ Rudimenta." The letter to Ringmann is its preface.—D'Avezac, Martin Waltzemüller, pp. 109-10.

¹⁰ Of this edition only a single copy remains. It was found early last century on an old book-stand in Paris, and purchased for one franc. After passing through the hands of M. Yemiz, it was sold to Mr. Griswold for 2,000 francs.

some verses printed on the page opposite. For Waldseemüller's name was substituted the *Gymnasium Vosagense*. A similar ignoring of the authorship of Waldseemüller is remarked in the *Cosmographia* or world-map itself. It bears neither the author's name nor any indication of the place where it was published. Evidently if Walter Lud had agreed to pay for the expenses of publication, he meant to have at least some of the credit of authorship and to prevent the Freiburg geographer from harvesting all the honors. Lud was obstinate in this view; for, not content to issue the second edition, already described, he issued a third, bearing date August 29, 1507, printed at St. Dié. While this edition was a word for word copy of the second edition, it was entirely reset, as appears from the distribution of the matter on the several pages. Strange to say, there exists a fourth edition of the *Introduction*, also dated August 29, also issued at St. Dié and printed from the same type as the third issue, and yet essentially different. For on the first, second, fifth and sixth leaves we find restored the text of the first edition, that is to say, the dedication to Maximilian I. by *Ilacomilus*, Waldseemüller's academic name, and the verses ascribing the authorship of the work to him. It seems hardly likely that Walter Lud would publish on the same day the same work in two such contradictory forms. As the date at that time did not appear on the title page, but was relegated to the last page of the book, it is quite conceivable that the publisher of this fourth edition, wishing to do justice to Waldseemüller's claims to the authorship, substituted the first, second, fifth and sixth pages of the original edition for the corresponding ones of the third, overlooking the date at the end. But if not issued on August 29, 1507, as the colophon declares, when was the fourth edition published? D'Avezac thinks that this tardy reparation to Waldseemüller was the consequence of the author's protestations in the *Margarita Philosophica* against the injustice done to him by his rivals in the publication of his World Map. This would throw back the issue of the fourth edition of the *Cosmographiae Introductio* until the middle of the year 1508.¹¹ Whether in those days types would be locked up so long may well be doubted, but we must not forget that the printers of St. Dié were not ordinary business men. D'Avezac's view is exposed to another objection. Waldseemüller himself, in 1509, published through John Grüninger at Strassburg a fifth edition of this celebrated little pamphlet. Does it seem likely that if in 1508 Walter

¹¹ The letter to Ringmann bears no date. The book has the date 1508. The preface was written shortly after Shrove Tuesday in 1508. This letter may have been written but a short time before the publication of the book, as Waldseemüller's treatise is a supplement to the last book of the work.

Lud or any one else had published the fourth edition, which surely did ample justice to his rights as to the authorship, Waldseemüller should proceed the following year to publish a new edition at Strassburg? But it is not our purpose to discuss this bibliographical problem here.

We see our hero's path was by no means strewn with roses. He had worked for months and years to construct his great map, and now his honors were claimed by others. Walter Lud, even before the 25th of April, 1507, had quarreled with Waldseemüller, and four months later was still doing his best to deprive him of the credit due him for his work as designer of the world map and author of the *Introduction*. Had Lud lived in the twentieth century we should denounce him as a literary robber. But in 1507 literary property and authors' rights were ideas hardly known. Copyright was unthought of. Printers printed or reprinted whatever they thought would bring them profit, without asking leave of writer or first publisher. The *Cosmographiae Introductio* itself, wholly apart from the wrong done to Martin Waldseemüller, was a glaring instance of literary pilfering. More than half the booklet consisted of the "Four Voyages" of Amerigo Vespucci, and yet we have no reason to think that Amerigo ever consented to their publication by the St. Dié printers or, for that matter, by any publisher. So Walter Lud's conceptions of literary property were elementary. No doubt he thought that the man that furnished the shekels for the publication deserved fully as much credit as the man that furnished the brains. By ascribing the work to the College of St. Dié he did justice to three men, if he did injustice to one. For had not Ringmann furnished the eulogistic distichs and revised the Latin text of the map? Had not Basin translated the "Four Voyages?" And had not he himself paid for the publication? We must not, therefore, measure Lud's offense by modern standards. Indeed, though the Freiburg geographer felt the injustice done him, yet he bore it like a gentleman. Not a word of vituperation; his protest consists of a simple statement of the facts. We cannot help respecting the modest, self-possessed scholar, who firmly insisted on his rights, but avoided all vulgarity. He had his reward. His claims were admitted even by those who had wronged him, and Waldseemüller died as canon of St. Dié.

We have given a somewhat lengthy account of Waldseemüller's trouble, not only because it illuminates literary conditions at the beginning of the sixteenth century and illustrates our hero's character, but also because Waldseemüller's world map of 1507, with accompanying *Introduction*, were the works that definitely gave to the New World the name of America. The two publications were

the Freiburg geographer's most noted achievement, the immortal parts, so to say, of the man; but were they in themselves less important, they would claim our attention because of the influence they exerted. We have assisted at their birth; let us briefly trace their fate.

Columbus discovered America, and yet the western continent bears the name of another, and that other a man of whom it is impossible to prove that he ever commanded a ship as captain. How is this to be explained? The world in general for centuries took the name as a matter of fact, as it does to-day. It is Alexander von Humboldt who first succeeded in arousing interest in the problem of the origin and history of the name America and made a great step towards its solution. He it was that drew attention to the *Cosmographiae Introductio*, and especially to the famous passage, so often reproduced, of which the translation is as follows:

"But now these parts [Asia, Africa, Europe] have been more fully explored, and now (as will be seen in what follows) a fourth part has been discovered by Americus Vespucius, and I do not see why it should not be called after its discoverer, a man of bright intellect, Amerige or America, that is to say, the land of Americus, since both Europe and Asia have received their names from women. Its situation and the customs of its inhabitants will be clearly understood from the 'Four Voyages' of Americus, which are subjoined."¹²

Here, then, in a treatise intended to explain a cartographical work we have the first proposal to call the world discovered by Columbus America. We have also the author's reason for so naming the newly discovered land. It had been discovered by Americus Vespucius. How could a well informed man, a specialist in geography, conceive the idea that Vespucci discovered America?

To answer this question we must again emphasize the fact that Waldseemüller wrote four hundred years ago. At that time news traveled far more slowly than now. There were no newspapers; printing was in its infancy. There were few readers; without many and cheap books general education is impossible. Without newspapers and readers news travels slowly and fame falls to the lot of the few. Conversely, few crave for fame or for what is often taken for fame, notoriety. The modern craze for notoriety was unknown in Columbus' day, and men did not have recourse to trickery to advertise themselves, nor did they blow their own trumpets. So it came about that Columbus found no time to spread the fame of his discovery, but left his deeds to establish his reputation. It is true Columbus' letter announcing his discovery of the Indies was published in Italy, France and Germany in ten editions between the years 1493 and 1505,¹³ but each edition hardly exceeded a thousand

¹² From Waldseemüller's *Cosmographiae Introductio*.

copies and reached only a small circle of readers. So it might well happen that the geographers of the puny village in Lorraine heard nothing of the achievements of the Genoese discoverer, especially as, so far as we know, the press did nothing to spread the fame of his later voyages, nor of his discovery of the great western continent. Meantime there had appeared a new discoverer, one whose tale was not a brief bald recital of geographic facts, but whose pen portrayed the strange wonders of a new world. This was Americus Vespucci, of Florence. We have no reason to think that Vespucci himself caused the publication of his letter to Lorenzo Pier Francesco dei Medici. The first edition known to us of the booklet appeared neither in Portugal, where the writer resided at the time, nor in Spain, where he went from Portugal, nor in Italy, where dwelt the addressee of the letter, but in Paris, from the press of Jehan de Lambert, in a Latin translation made by Fra Giovanni de Giocondo. But the Florentine's naïve recital of the strange manners and customs of the natives of the new world, for such he pronounced the new found lands to be, and the hair-breadth escapes of himself and his companions evidently took the popular fancy and excited curiosity. Between 1503 and 1508, that is to say between the first publication of the letter to Lorenzo dei Medici and the publication of Waldseemüller's map, some fifteen editions of the same appeared in Latin and German translations, mostly in France and Germany. One of the earliest of the publishers of the pamphlet had the happy idea of taking from the text the expression "new world" and placing it in its title in large, striking type. The book accordingly as "*Novus Mundus*" drew all the more attention and gave to the new discoveries a complexion wholly absent in the letter of Columbus to Raphael de Sanxis. That this remarkable story of the discovery of a new world made a profound impression on the geographers of St. Dié is apparent from Ringmann's republishing the "*Novus Mundus*" in 1505 from the press of Andreas Hüpfuff, as well as from their inducing their patron, the Duke of Lorraine, to secure for them the letter to Pietro Soderini, gonfaloniere of Florence, usually called the "Four Voyages of Americus Vespuccius." From neither the "*Novus Mundus*" nor the "Four Voyages," in which the name of Columbus hardly appears and his merits are certainly not dwelt upon,¹⁴ could the St. Dié cartographer so much as guess

¹³ They were as follows: In 1493 four Latin editions, without date and place; one Latin edition at Rome; one Latin edition at Paris. In 1494 Latin edition at Basel. In 1497 German edition at Strassburg. In 1505 Italian edition at Venice.

¹⁴ These letters of Vespucci were simple recitals of his own voyages, and seem to be the jottings down of the mariner during his travels. His silence regarding the explorations of his predecessors must not, therefore, be judged to be an intentional ignoring of the credit due to them.

the real state of the case, the prominence of the Genoese and the comparative insignificance of the Florentine explorer. Waldseemüller was concerned not with the practical importance of the discoveries in the West and East Indies, but with their bearing on the picture of the world handed down by Ptolemy; in other words, on theoretical science. So it came about that the story of Vespucci satisfied him, that the Florentine was the real discoverer of the new world and that after him it should be called America.

We may now pursue the history of Waldseemüller's world map. In his marine map, published in 1516, the author informs us that one thousand copies of the map were issued; in his letter to Ringmann (1508)¹⁵ he states that the chart had been scattered over the world, and that it had brought him fame and glory. In the same year the Benedictine abbot, John Heidenberg, of Tritenheim, the well-known humanist Trithemius, speaks in highly commendatory terms to his friend, William de Velde, of a globe and map published at Strassburg and purchased by him at a very moderate price.¹⁶ It seems all but certain that Trithemius' map was our map of 1507. In 1508 the famous German geographer and globe designer, Johann Schoener, drew two very much reduced copies of Waldseemüller's chart of 1507, which were found not so many years ago in the university libraries of Bonn and Munich by Von Wieser and Elter.¹⁷ The Polish geographer, John Studniczka, copied into his geographical treatise the two small hemispheres which Waldseemüller placed in the upper part of his great map to illustrate on the one hand the world of Ptolemy and on the other the world found by the Spanish and Portuguese discoverers. It would take up too much space to trace all the plagiarisms of Waldseemüller's map that were perpetrated during the next hundred years. Suffice it to say that even as late as Mercator we find evidence of the persisting influence of the great map, whose fortunes we are tracing. Naturally the plagiarists were in no haste to publish the name of the man whose work they appropriated. And so it happened that ere long Waldseemüller's name fell more and more into oblivion. In the early years of the seventeenth century the Flemish cartographer, Abraham Ortelius, queries whether Waldseemüller and Ilacomilus are one or two persons. Thereafter the Freiburg scholar almost disappears from the annals of learning

¹⁵ See above, p. 7a.

¹⁶ The price asked for Lawrence Fries' reduced edition of Waldseemüller's "Carta Marina" was five gulden. It may be inferred that the great map of 1507 hardly cost more than ten gulden.

¹⁷ To Schoener belonged at one time the Waldseemüller world map and his "Carta Marina," which were recently found by Father Joseph Fischer, S. J., in the Castle of Wolfegg.

until Von Humboldt revived his memory some three-quarters of a century ago. Humboldt, who studied the early history of American discovery with unprecedented zeal and perseverance, searched high and low for the first map that bore the name of America, the Waldseemüller mappemonde of 1507, as he correctly inferred from the *Cosmographiae Introductio*. But success did not reward his research. After him all the great Americanists of the nineteenth century—Winsor, Harrisse, Ruge, Nordenskiöld, Von Wieser—took part in the fruitless hunt until the great Nordenskiöld was all but convinced that Waldseemüller had never published the *Cosmographia* of which he had written the *Introduction*. Both his fac-simile atlas and his *Periplus* (1897) took this skeptical view. Still the last work was printed only three years before the Freiburg humanist's work was brought to light. The honor of making this discovery was reserved for the Jesuit Father Joseph Fischer. While making researches touching the Norse discoveries in Greenland the learned Jesuit unexpectedly came upon the two great world maps of Waldseemüller, the map of 1507 and the *Carta Marina* of 1516. Towards the end of 1903 he and his former professor in cartography, the distinguished Dr. Franz von Wieser, published a magnificent fac-simile edition of this monumental work, together with an exhaustive commentary, in which no pains were spared to shed light on the work and its history, an achievement which has received the highest commendation from the first authorities on cartography in Germany.¹⁸

We take pleasure in inserting here the judgment of one of the highest authorities in the field of science, Professor Dr. Wagner. It appeared in No. 6 of this year's *Gelehrten Anzeigen*, of Göttingen, in a notice extending over fourteen pages. Here it is:

"It was especially fortunate that the discovery in question was made by one who is thoroughly acquainted with the infancy of cartography. A scholar of Franz von Wieser, Joseph Fischer, by publishing an excellent study on the discoveries of the Northmen in America, Freiburg, 1902 [English version, St. Louis, 1903], has just given undoubted proof of his ability to clear up the dark story of the beginnings of cartography at the time of the renascence of Ptolemy, both by his indefatigable search after new authorities and by his adroit combinations. And he could not have found a more useful co-laborer than the man [F. von Wieser] whose acquaintance with that age is more complete than that of any other adept of our science at the present day."

The result of this discovery has been to call renewed attention

¹⁸ Many of their results have been embodied in this life of Waldseemüller.

to the scientific merits of the Freiburg cartographer, and to vindicate for him a prominent place among its promoters. Incidentally it has also made us acquainted with Waldseemüller's methods of work and given us new insight into his character.

We have thus acquired some idea of the influence exercised by our map on contemporary and later science. Let us now study it for a moment in itself and as an expression of the ways and methods of the author.

Waldseemüller was a typical scholar of his day. He prized and cherished the older learning, but he also welcomed the new. He was essentially a disciple of Ptolemy; the basis of our map was the Ulm Ptolemy of 1884. The projection of his map was the old Ptolemaic projection. His picture of central Europe and western Asia was Ptolemaic. But he did not reject modern lights. For the north of Europe he followed Claudius Clavus, for central and eastern Asia, so far as the text goes, the great Venetian, Marco Polo, and for the outline an unknown work based on Marco Polo's books. He was specially interested in the Spanish and Portuguese transatlantic discoveries, and was here guided by Amerigo Vespucci and the Canerio map, which he thought, and probably correctly thought, to be founded on the cartographic work of the Florentine navigators. He was not only progressive, but in his progressiveness he displayed good judgment, for he could have had no safer guides than Claudius Clavus and Marco Polo, and the Canerio map, which was the only chart of the western continent available to him, was the best and fullest he could have found at the time. He was evidently guided by the same spirit which directed Regiomontanus, Nicholas of Cusa, Behaim and Toscanelli, the spirit of Dom Manuel of Portugal and Columbus.

What shall we say of his judgment of the value of the transatlantic discoveries? Of course, Vespucci had declared that he had found a "new world," but this expression may refer to the novel character of the inhabitants and of the products of the countries found as well as to the view that America was a fourth continent which belonged to neither Europe, Asia nor Africa. Indeed, it is very doubtful that Vespucci meant to claim credit for the discovery of a new fourth continent. But Waldseemüller clearly calls the new land a fourth continent. It is true that later, when he had become acquainted with the achievements of Columbus and had come under the influence of Columbus' views, he took a step backward. In the Strassburg Ptolemy of 1513 the western continent no longer bears the name of America, and in the *Carta Marina* of 1516 he calls it Cuba, a part of Asia. He left a gap of thousands of miles, between the lands visited by Marco Polo and what he

now took to be the east of Asia. The geographical discoveries had succeeded each other so rapidly that the scientific mind of the time was unable to follow and assimilate them. Cartographic notions were in a state of flux and did not crystallize for many a year. Else how explain the name of Indies generally given to Spanish America? or the name of Indians bestowed on the natives of English and French as well as of Spanish America? But if the *Carta Marina* is in this respect evidence of retrogression, what shall we say of Waldseemüller's abandonment of the new name America? Of course, when he became convinced that the land of Cuba was not a fourth continent, but merely a part of Asia, the name America was superfluous; its omission was a confession of having blundered. It was something more, however; it was an act of reparation. For the *Carta Marina* openly recants the statement of the *Cosmographia* and the *Cosmographiae Introductio* that Americus Vespucius had discovered the new world. Columbus, the *Carta Marina* tells us, was the first discoverer, Pedralvarez¹⁹ the second and Amerigo Vespucci the third. As Cabral did not discover Brazil till April 22, 1500, Waldseemüller must, when he published the *Carta Marina*, have thought Vespucci's first voyage to have taken place later than 1500, though the "Four Voyages" assigns Vespucci's first voyage to the year 1497.²⁰ It is evident from his erasing the name America from both the world map in the Ptolemy of 1513 and the *Carta Marina* (1516), as well as from his emphatically attributing the honor of first discovering the new world to the Genoese admiral, that Waldseemüller meant to correct his former error and make reparation to Columbus. We admire his honesty and love of justice, though they did not repair the wrong done. The thousand copies of the great wall map of 1507 spoke not only to the scholar in his study, but to the public in general, and the men who pilfered from the geographer of St. Dié could not fail to spread and perpetuate his unintentional error. We may regret that the western continent was not named after Columbus; it is a satisfaction to know that he was deprived of this honor neither through malice on the part of Waldseemüller nor, as far as we know, through a desire to glorify himself on the part of Amerigo Vespucci. We are convinced that Amerigo Vespucci never intentionally had a part in appropriating the honors due to Columbus. But the entire story of the Florentine still stands in need of being cleared up. Nothing would contribute more to throw

¹⁹ Pedralvarez Cabral is meant. While sailing with fifteen Portuguese ships to the East Indies, he was driven by a tempest to Brazil, which he touched on April 22, 1500.

²⁰ Amerigo Vespucci returned from his voyage with Alonso de Hojleda at the end of June, 1500; some say in April.

light on his story than the publication of a critical edition of Vespucci's letters. What is most tantalizing is the knowledge that such an edition has lain ready for the printer for four years. The learned Florentine scholar, Signor Gustavo Uzielli, has been patiently waiting for the Italian Geographical Society to redeem its promise to publish the invaluable collection, only to be disappointed. Can nothing be done to hasten its issue? It is a curious coincidence that the man who deprived Columbus of his due honors in naming the new world was himself almost robbed of the credit of being its godfather.

We must not conclude this discussion of Waldseemüller's world map of 1507 without giving our readers a short description of this famous cartographical monument. It is, as the author himself states in the *Cosmographiae Introductio*, an unusually large chart, four feet six inches in height by eight feet in length. It is made up of twelve folios, laid side by side in three rows, four folios in each row. Each folio measures about eighteen by twenty-four inches. The map is engraved on wood and done with surprising neatness and precision. The folios fit one another to a nicety. The upper part of the map offers us two small hemispheres, each in charge of a representative of geographical science. The eastern hemisphere, that known to the ancients and figured in Ptolemy's great atlas, is exhibited by the old Alexandrian astronomer himself, while near the newly discovered lands stands the figure of Amerigo Vespucci. The name identifies each figure. The size of the map proclaims that it is meant for a wall map, one of the earliest if not the earliest of its kind. It also explains why not one of the thousand copies has survived. The exemplar found by Father Fischer at Wolfegg is a proof preserved because it was bound in with a volume of engravings which had once belonged to Waldseemüller's younger contemporary, the cartographer Johannes Schoener. The binding had preserved it. The map in every part is a creditable specimen of the art of wood cutting, especially the figures, though in this respect it is excelled by the *Carta Marina*, the art work of which strongly suggests the hand of Albrecht Durer, or at any rate of his school. The technical perfection of the work renders it likely that it was not engraved at the small printing establishment of St. Dié, but rather at the neighboring town of Strassburg, which boasted of several able engravers at the time. The map bears neither the name of the author nor that of St. Dié, where the *Introduction* suggests that it was printed. But it corresponds exactly with the description of his large map given by Waldseemüller in the treatise which was written to accompany it. He tells us that this map was very large, made up of several folios, distinguishes the realms

of the great sovereigns by their emblems, indicates the shallow parts of the ocean by crosses and gives to the new world the name of America. All these peculiarities the Wolfegg map offers. It is undoubtedly Waldseemüller map of 1507. The magnificent facsimile of our chart published by Fischer and Von Wieser, which should be in every American college library, cannot fail to impress all who see it with the care, precision and taste of the author of the original.

At the same time as he published his great map Waldseemüller published a globe. He himself announces both the map and the globe in his *Cosmographiae Introductio*. In size we are informed by him it was far inferior to the map. Besides in his letter to Johann Auerbach, written on the 7th of April, 1507, we read: "The globe I have gotten up in accordance with the world map of Ptolemy is not yet printed, but it will be printed within a month."²¹ In fine, at the close of the *Introduction* the author remarks that in designing the map he had placed the equator according to Ptolemy, while on the globe he had been guided in this particular by the Portuguese marine charts. When, however, the map of 1507 was discovered, writers were not wanting who identified the globe with the two small hemispheres printed at the top of the map and described above. But the words of Waldseemüller leave no room for doubt. And, indeed, some years before the discovery of the Wolfegg map L. Gallois²² identified the Waldseemüller globe with the globe gores in the Hauslab-Liechtenstein collection at Vienna, on the ground that the latter fulfils all the demands of the description cited above from the *Cosmographiae Introductio*, which is not true of the little hemispheres on the map. Father Fischer approves of the views of Gallois and is preparing a paper in support of this thesis.²³ For the present we may refer our readers to page 14 of Fischer's and Von Wieser's "The World Maps of Waldseemüller," where he will find a fac-simile of the Hauslab-Liechtenstein gores.

Waldseemüller was still in the midst of his quarrel with Walter Lud about the recognition of his authorship of the *Cosmographia* and its *Introduction* when, as we have seen, his pen produced a new work, a treatise on architecture and perspective for Gregory Reisch's encyclopædia, the *Margarita Philosophica*. Though in itself ephemeral, it proves that he was a scholar of varied interests. Nor did his excursion into the region of art and mathematics tempt him away

²¹ Cf. C. Schmidt. Essay on Ringmann, in the *Mémoires Soc. Arch. de Lorraine*, 1873, p. 227.

²² L. Gallois. *Les Géographes Allemands*, p. 48, and, the same, *Améric Vespuce*, p. 11 ff.

²³ We understand that this important paper will appear in the publications of the United States Catholic Historical Society.

from his principal pursuit—geography. The scheme of publishing a new edition of Ptolemy had taken possession of Waldseemüller and Ringmann, and they did not abandon it. Times had changed. Duke René was dead; the relations of Waldseemüller with Walter Lud were probably altered. The little printing establishment at St. Dié still sent out an occasional work, but for years, as far as we know, Waldseemüller published no work through the St. Dié press. Whatever be the date of the fourth edition of the *Cosmographiae Introductio*, if it is really anterior to the fifth, the recognition of his authorship did not satisfy the injured author. His contribution to the *Margarita Philosophica* had brought him into relations with the Strassburg typographer, Johann Grüninger. It was Grüninger, therefore, who in 1509 published a new—the fifth—edition of the *Introduction*. At the same time Grüninger published a booklet entitled *Globus Mundi, Declaratio Sive Descriptio Mundi*, identical in paper, form and type with the *Cosmographiae Introductio*. Both, moreover, contain the statement that they were proof read by John Adelffus, of Mülingen. All this points to some closer connection between the two booklets, and this indication is strengthened by the reference to a larger map called a Cosmography which seems to be identical with Waldseemüller's *Cosmographia*. We translate:

"The distance between two places is not easily determined on this small globe, because all the degrees could not be marked thereon. If you wish to ascertain distances you will consult the larger map of the plane *Cosmographia*, in which you will find the places more surely and correctly according to their longitude and latitude."²⁴

Taking into consideration both the external and the internal evidence, there is little room for doubt that this *Declaratio Mundi* was intended to do the same office for Waldseemüller's globe that the *Cosmographiae Introductio* was meant to do for his planeglobe.

The next work published by the Freiburg cartographer was an "Itinerary Map of Europe," for which Mathias Ringmann wrote an introduction or, as the author calls it in this case *Descriptio Europae*. This map has been known for some time. Ringmann's *Descriptio*, to which Waldseemüller himself prefixed a *Manuductio in Cartan Europae*, with a dedication of the to Duke Anthony, son of René, was published by Johann Grüninger at Strassburg in April, 1511,

²⁴ This booklet was an amusing conceit. At the same time it affords clear evidence that the pedagogues of those days were not all mere repeaters of old, long-known tricks. The "Grammar in Pictures" undertakes to teach the eight (*sic*) parts of speech by representing them graphically. The noun is represented by a pastor, the pronoun by his vicar, the verb by the king, the adverb by the queen, the conjunction by the cup-bearer, the preposition by the church warden and the interjection by the fool.

while Waldseemüller's dedication is dated one month earlier. The map was on a large scale, being, in fact, a combination of a number of separate maps in Ptolemy's atlas. For Waldseemüller the work was a kind of side issue, for, as we have seen, since 1505 he had been busy preparing a new edition of Ptolemy.

And thus we return to Waldseemüller's life work, the great Strassburg Ptolemy of 1513, from which, as from the second and third editions of the *Cosmographiae Introductio*, every mention of his name has been excluded. We met it at first in the year 1505, two years before the issue of the world map with the name America. We find it referred to in the "Speculum Orbis" of Walter Lud, published at Strassburg in 1507. Lud here declares that he purposes to pay for the publication of this Ptolemy, then in preparation by Martin Waldseemüller, a man extremely well versed in cartography. Again, after the quarrel with Waldseemüller, Walter Lud in his dedication of Ringmann's "Grammatica Figurata,"²⁵ published in St. Dié in 1509, tells the Bishop of Toul that he hopes to publish the Ptolemy in a few months. As late as 1511, in the preface to his last work, the *Descriptio Europae*, Ringmann²⁶ speaks of his own and his friend's work in preparing a new edition of Ptolemy. Ringman, indeed, in furtherance of the project, made a journey to Italy in 1508. There in Ferrara he met the learned Giles Gregory Giraldi, who aided him by preparing a key to the Greek system of numeration found in Ptolemy. In Italy he met also Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, Count of Concordia, the nephew of the great Pico della Mirandola, and like him a man of learning. Pico found an unusually fine Greek codex of Ptolemy's geography, which he placed at Ringmann's disposition and which was used in preparing the Strassburg Ptolemy of 1513. From 1505, therefore, until 1511 we have repeated reference to the fact that Waldseemüller and Ringmann were engaged in preparing an edition of Ptolemy's geography which in the earlier years Walter Lud was to have paid for and issued from his press at St. Dié. As late as 1509 his dedication prefixed to the "Grammatica Figurata" speaks of publishing the Ptolemy of Ringmann in a few months.

Still at this very time the honor of publishing the work had been destined to other patrons of science. The great atlas itself is evi-

²⁵ Mathias Ringmann died in that year, while professor at Schlettstadt, at the early age of twenty-nine. His friends Beatus Rhenanus (Bilde) and Johannes Russer erected a monument "to Mathias Ringmann, Philletius, Vogesigena, who spread the knowledge of literature in Alsace, the eminent Latin and learned Greek scholar."

²⁶ The Latin word is *consummatum est*. Whether this includes the printing is not certain. Fischer and Von Wieser think that the woodcuts of the figures of the winds are too fine to be done in that little village.

dence of this fact. For there we find a letter, dated in 1509, written by Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, announcing that he had sent to the editors by Ringmann a fine Greek Ptolemy and exhorting them to persevere in using every effort to perfect their edition of the Ptolemy. It is addressed not to Walter Lud, but to Dr. Jacob Æsztlér and associates. By closer examination the associates are reduced to one, George Ubelin, who published the second edition of the Strassburg Ptolemy (1520). Who were Jacob Æsztlér and George Ubelin? They were lawyers in the ecclesiastical court of the Bishop of Strassburg, doctors of canon law, and therefore probably clerics. The publisher of the Ptolemy was Johann Schott, of Strassburg, after whom the work is sometimes called Schott's Ptolemy.

Waldseemüller had changed patrons; he had gained nothing so far as his fame was concerned. While Ringmann's name is at least referred to in Pico della Mirandola's letter, we shall look in vain for Waldseemüller's in Schott's Ptolemy. True, the story we have told of its preparation and the admitted connection of Ringmann with the work would by themselves convince us that not the two canonists were the authors, but Ringmann's old partner, Ilacomilus. But we are not obliged to base on conjecture our attribution of Schott's Ptolemy to Waldseemüller. We have direct and convincing testimony to this fact. Our witness is Lawrence Fries, city physician of Metz and a noted mathematician. In 1522 John Grüninger, the Strassburg typographer, already well known to our readers, determined to publish a new, reduced edition of Schott's Ptolemy, and engaged Fries to prepare the work. We are not much interested in this geographical venture, for it is a production in every way inferior to the original. What is important for our purpose is a notice found inserted at folio 100, in which we read: "Lest we appear to be elated by the credit which belong to another, we notify our readers that these maps were originally designed by Martin Ilacomylus, now peacefully dead." The maps of the Schott Ptolemy, Fries tells us, were drawn by Waldseemüller. The Freiburg scholar had devoted eight or more years to his masterpiece, and Æsztlér and Ubelin figure as the editors. Such seems to have been the custom of the time, to judge by Waldseemüller's and Ringmann's experience, as well as by the experience of other geographers of their day. These scholars worked for the advancement of science without pay, nay, without the expectation to gather glory and fame by their toil and genius. Should not posterity bestow on them the laurels their contemporaries refused them?

The Strassburg Ptolemy of 1513 is planned on the lines which guided Waldseemüller in designing the map of 1507. He followed

Ptolemy, but did not ignore the progress made by the moderns. Accordingly he divided his atlas into two parts. The first part consists of the traditional twenty-seven maps of the Alexandrian geographer, the second of twenty maps based on more modern data, especially on Portuguese marine maps. As has been already remarked, the newly discovered western continent no longer bears the name of America. The artistic and technical merits of the work are of a high order, in this resembling the Waldseemüller map of 1507. It is worth while to add that in this respect it forms a great contrast to the Fries-Grüniger edition of 1522. The latter issue, which is in every way an inferior piece of work, is also distinguished from the map in the Strassburg Ptolemy by giving to the new world the name of America. We may, therefore, infer that in 1522 the question of naming the western continent was decided. In spite of the fact that the first proposer of the name America had proclaimed Columbus to be the real discoverer of the new world, and though Waldseemüller erased the name America from his later maps, America remained the name of the western continent.

Martin Waldseemüller's cartographical activity did not end with the work he did for the Schott Ptolemy. He published one more large map similar in size and workmanship to the map of 1507, and this time at last he was to have the satisfaction of seeing his work go out under his own name. The new map was entitled *Carta Marina*, and was intended primarily as a guide for navigators. The map itself tells us that it was compiled and designed by Martin Ilacomilus, and completed²⁷ in the town of St. Dié. Its date is 1516. No explanatory text of this chart is known to have been published. The *Carta Marina* shows that when he published it our cartographer's mind had lost none of its acumen and his hand none of its cunning. If we compare it with the map of 1507 it shows a marked advance—not so much in the design of the new as in his picture of the old world. Africa and Northern Europe have been greatly modified, but the greatest changes meet us in the representation of Southern Asia. The two peninsulas of India on the former map are drawn according to Ptolemy's ideas, and are far from correctly figured; in the *Carta Marina*, which follows the Portuguese Portulane, they are drawn with approximate correctness. These parts of the chart, as well as the western continent, are manifestly copied from Canerio; in parts the resemblance is so great, both maps coinciding even in size, that the one seems to be a tissue paper copy of the other. Fischer and Von Wieser sum up their opinion in the words: "The *Carta Marina* of Waldseemüller is a printed edition of the Canerio map."

²⁷ Gaspar and Miguel Cortereal were two Portuguese navigators who, in 1500, seem to have discovered New Foundland and Labrador.

This expression must not, however, be interpreted to mean that the *Carta Marina* is a slavish copy of the Canerio map. To do so would be to do a gross injustice to the designer. He was not a man to suppress his own judgment. Accordingly we find that in the interior of Asia and Africa the new map is both a corrected and an enlarged version of Canerio. In the north of Europe Waldseemüller manifestly follows a low German model, for many names of places show low German or Norse forms. The agreement with the Canerio map appears especially in the outlines firstly of America, secondly of South Africa, thirdly of Greenland, fourthly of the land of Cortereal,²⁸ fifthly of North Africa, especially the shores of the Red Sea, and sixthly of India.

The *Carta Marina*, as far as we know, was Waldseemüller's last work. As we have said, it was published at St. Dié, which therefore saw the beginning and the end of Waldseemüller's career as an author. As is true of the lives of most literary and scientific men, the story of the life of the Freiburg cartographer is the story of his works. All we know of him after the appearance of the *Carta Marina* is that he died, probably in the year 1522, as canon of St. Dié.²⁹ At all events, when Lawrence Fries published the Ptolemy of 1522 he speaks of him as dead.

To the end of his life, therefore, Waldseemüller remained an honored member of the faculty of St. Dié. His quarrel with Walter Lud, which lasted so many years, had not shaken his position in the Gymnasium of the Vosges. Either their literary differences had not irretrievably embittered the two men of science, or the canon law protected the Freiburg canon against the hostility of Walter Lud. Whatever be the solution of the problem, literary property in the sixteenth century was almost an unknown conception. Author's and publisher's rights were in their infancy. Here, again, one of Waldseemüller's works, the Ptolemy of 1513, was one of the pioneers of copyright. To Æszler and Ubelin Charles V. accorded the privilege of being the sole publishers for four years. That the privilege was not without value we may infer from Ubelin's issuing a second edition in 1518.

Martin Waldseemüller's name, which even in 1570 had fallen into oblivion to such a degree that the cartographer Abraham Ortelius expressed his doubt whether Waldseemüller and Ilacomylus were the same person, has been revived by modern science. Since Alexander von Humboldt, he has been known as probably the man who

²⁸ So Fischer and Von Wieser, *The World Maps of Martin Waldseemüller*, p. 22, foot note. Their authority is L. Gallois, *Améric Vespuce*, p. 31 ff.

²⁹ Fischer and Von Wieser sum up their opinion in the words: "The *Carta Marina* of Waldseemüller is a printed edition of the Canerio."

gave its name to the new world, Fischer set at rest all doubts on this point. He found the map which is, so to say, America's baptismal certificate. Fischer and Von Wieser have shown that Waldseemüller was not merely a geographical curiosity, but that as a cartographer he influenced for upwards of a hundred years the course of cartographic science. His story is by no means a story of success. Ability, industry, learning, originality were his, yet his life was a struggle, a partly fruitless struggle, to have his work acknowledged and his merit recognized. The chief product of his scientific toil, the masterpiece of his life's work, the Strassburg Ptolemy of 1513, was claimed by others, and only a lucky accident has preserved for us the testimony that the achievement was his. His contemporaries allowed him scant justice; it was reserved for our age to bring to life and light his work and to do homage to his name.

CHARLES GEORGE HERBERMANN.

New York.

THE MEANING OF CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.

IT IS difficult to estimate with any degree of accuracy how many have given assent to the principles of so-called Christian Science. In 1888 Mrs. Eddy claimed more than a million followers scattered throughout the world.¹ In 1902 Mark Twain wrote that in America alone there were a million members of the sect.² The 1904 World's Almanac lowers the claim of Christian Science to seven hundred and sixty-nine churches and societies and about fifty thousand members. Let us suppose these last and more modest figures are near the truth. They do not tax our credulity, yet they give us some surprise and attract our serious attention. We must admit that "Christian Science is a thing we can no longer ignore. It is a force that must be seriously reckoned with."³ It has already duped too many, and holds them with a grasp that neither facts and reasons nor gibes and taunts have power to loosen. Its spread will not be thwarted while most Christians sit idly by and raise no voice of earnest protest against the un-Christian blasphemies and unscientific vagaries that Mrs. Eddy has sent a-mas-

¹ This claim is made in the one hundred and thirty-fifth edition of "Science and Health, with Key to the Scriptures." When we note only the page, we refer to this text-book of Mrs. Eddy.

² Cf. *North American Review*, December, 1902.

³ Cf. Rev. A. F. Underhill, in the preface to his "Valid Objections to So-called Christian Science."

querading under the holy and noble guise of Christianity and science.

To many Christian Science is but a name. Others know no more about it than that it is something like faith-cure, and its members claim to heal the sick by making people think they are not sick. Yet Christian Science pretends to be a system of metaphysics and religion, and it goes without saying that it is deemed by its votaries to be really Christian and scientific. Like the positivism of Comte, it is refuted for most readers merely by an exposition of its creed. We shall try to ransack the books of Mrs. Eddy, to find out what she means and to form some clear and crisp notions of the tenets of her sect.

What, then, does Mrs. Eddy mean? That's the question. Just what Mrs. Eddy means is the hardest thing in the world to get at, so elusive and Protean is the religion that she teaches. As a matter of fact, Christian Scientists insist that we who are on the outside cannot get into the inner meanings of their esoteric dogmas. Why not? Because we do not accept them with trust in Mrs. Eddy; we read her words "in a purely critical vein." Mr. W. D. McCracken, of the Christian Science Publication Committee, says that if we "approach the subject in a purely critical vein" we shall for this very reason miss the real signification of Christian Science.⁴ Why, unless we "approach the subject in a purely critical vein" we can give only that definition of Christian Science which will probably be found in the dictionaries of the next century, and say that it is a form of religion invented and propagated by Mrs. Eddy. No, we cannot keep away from this "purely critical vein." The man of thought and prudence will not be so foolhardy and heedless as to swallow Mrs. Eddy's doses of diluted science and disintegrated Christianity without a critical and painstaking analysis of what she says and what she means to say.

In her text-book, "Science and Health," Mrs. Eddy lays down a definition of her new religion. This definition is not built up according to the rules of Aristotelian logic—of course not—we should never expect any Aristotelian logic from Mrs. Eddy. Her definitions generally defy analysis, when approached "in a purely critical vein." In point of fact, we can scarcely ferret out the meaning of this definition at all. Why, then, do we give it? Because it is pellucid enough to enable us through it to catch a glimpse, if not of her thought, at least of the obscurity of the verbiage with which Mrs. Eddy is wont to enwrap her thought. Here is the definition: "Christian Science is based on the teachings of Scripture which it interprets, giving the Christ principle

⁴ Cf. *North American Review*, vol. 173, p. 232.

and rule in Divine Metaphysics which heals the sick and sinner." Such a definition speaks for itself.

There are four fundamental principles to this new form of Christianity. They are not to be found in the New Testament; yet they are the quintessence of Christ's teaching as discovered by Mrs. Eddy. These four principles are undisguised and unadulterated Pantheism; yet Mrs. Eddy claims that they are self-evident. "Even if read backward, these propositions will be found to agree in statement and *proof*."⁵ Indeed, Mrs. Eddy makes so much of these assumptions that we have little doubt she would agree with Mark Twain's Christian Scientist and say: "You can jumble it all up, and it makes no difference. . . . Read backwards, or forwards, or perpendicularly, or at any given angle, these four propositions will always be found to agree in statement and in *proof*."⁶

These wonderful, self-evident, fundamental principles make up the *scientific statement*, the cure-all creed of Christian Science:

1. God is All in all.
2. God is Good; Good is Mind.
3. God, Spirit, being all, nothing is matter.
4. Life, God, omnipotent Good deny death, evil, sin, disease.

From these four fundamental principles flow two very important *scientific* definitions. They are as clear-cut and as logical as we may hope to find any of Mrs. Eddy's *scientific* definitions. We give them just as we find them, jumbled and tumbled together in their author's inevitable and hopeless jargon:

1. Scientific Definition of Immortal Mind.

God: Principle, Life, Truth, Love, Soul, Spirit, Mind.

Man: God's universal idea, individual, perfect, eternal.

Idea: An image in the Mind; the immediate object of Understanding.

2. Scientific Definition of Mortal Mind.

1st degree [unreality]. *Physical*: Passions and appetites, fear, depraved will, pride, envy, deceit, hatred, revenge, sin, disease, death.

2d degree [transitional qualities: evil disappearing]. *Moral*: Honesty, affection, compassion, hope, faith, meekness, temperance.

3d degree [reality; spiritual salvation]. *Spiritual*: Faith, wisdom, power, purity, understanding, health, love.⁷

If this hodge-podge means anything, it means Ideal Pantheism,

⁵ Page 7.

⁶ Cf. "Christian Science and the Book of Mrs. Eddy." *Cosmopolitan*, October, 1899.

⁷ Page 9.

such as Fichte, Hegel, Schelling and others evolved long before Mrs. Eddy put her new form of Christianity on the market.

Let us first examine the Idealism of so-called Christian Science. It is not, of course, admitted by Mrs. Eddy, yet cannot be reasonably denied. She assumes, nay, rather, she *proves* by the foregoing *scientific* definitions that "matter has no real existence."⁸ "Matter is nothing beyond an image in mortal mind."⁹ "The Science of Mind shows conclusively how it is that matter seemeth to be, but is not. Divine Science, rising above physical theories, excludes matter, resolves things into thoughts and replaces the objects of material sense with spiritual ideas."¹⁰ Then the fat man is not a man of fat, after all, but only a man of fatty belief—he only thinks he is fat. He should "rise above physical theories" and replace his fat by "spiritual ideas." Is not that what Mrs. Eddy means? Yes, that is practically what she says. One of her pupils wrote her: "How can I believe there is no such thing as matter when I weigh over two hundred pounds and carry this weight daily?" She answered: "By learning that matter is but manifest mortal mind"—manifest unreality, a dream, a morbid hallucination not unlike a nightmare. "You entertain an *adipose belief* of yourself as a substance." Transfer the epithet, and, presto, 'tis done—you are not an adipose substance, you have only an adipose belief of substance.

Since matter is nothing, there is no such thing as nerves, pain, sickness, death, sin. They are all "errors of mortal mind." "There is no pain in truth and no Truth in pain; no nerve in Mind, no Mind in nerve; no matter in Mind, no Mind in matter; no matter in Life, no Life in matter; no matter in Good, no Good in matter."¹¹ "The only reality of sin, sickness, or death is the awful fact that unrealities seem real to human belief."¹² "Death is an illusion, the lie of life in matter. . . . Any material evidence of death is false."¹³

What, then, are sin, sickness, pain and death? Only images in mortal mind—not in immortal Mind, for that is God—but in mortal mind. In all her works Mrs. Eddy is ever harping on one string—"the errors of mortal mind." What is mortal mind? "Mortal mind designates something which has no real existence."¹⁴ "There is really no such thing as mortal mind."¹⁵ Mortal mind is nothing at all, just as "mortal man, man as we know him, is a material falsity."

⁸ Page 575.

⁹ Page 10.

¹⁰ Page 17.

¹¹ Page 7.

¹² Page 468.

¹³ Page 575.

¹⁴ Page 8.

¹⁵ Page 419.

So the "errors of mortal mind" turn out to be the errors of nothing at all! Sickness, pain and death are only the subjective state of nothing;¹⁶ images of nothing in nothing! Mrs. Eddy would be clearer if she set it down boldly that mortal man, mortal mind, sickness, pain, death and all else except God are nothing at all; but clear thinking is not one of the wares she barter—she long ago found it to be one of the "errors of mortal mind." However, she can scarcely have the hardihood to deny that she teaches Idealism.

It is Pantheism that she openly rejects, though, with delicious inconsistency, she teaches it as covertly and as boldly as Idealism.

"Mind," she says, "is the only I, or *Us*—the one God." "There is but one *Us*." The *Ego* of Pantheism she does not like so well as the *Us* of Eddyism. The two are the same except in name. This new form of Pantheism also appears in terms that connote a smattering of Kant. "In Science, Mind is one—including noumena and phenomena, God and His thoughts."¹⁷ The Kantian phraseology is here distorted. According to Kant, noumenon is the thing in itself, phenomenon is the thing as it appears to us; there are many noumena and phenomena outside of God. According to Mrs. Eddy, Mind is God, and man is God's thought; Mind includes God (noumena) and His thoughts (phenomena); therefore, God includes God and man. This is Pantheism.

Again and again the same false philosophy crops out. She admits the existence of nothing but transcendental Being, Truth, Beauty; and makes these terms synonymous with God. God is the only real principle; all that is real is Mind, *i. e.*, God. "God is divine Principle, supreme incorporeal Being, Mind, Spirit, Soul, Life, Truth, Love. Are these terms synonymous? They are. They refer to one absolute God, and nothing else. . . . Is there more than one principle? There is not."¹⁸ The only reality, then, is one soul, one principle of one life; and soul, principle and life are God. The Ideal Pantheist postulates just such a foundation for his superstructure of philosophical thought.

Such is Mrs. Eddy's theory of Christianity—Ideal Pantheism in a new and more specious form—"a theory," says Dean Hart, of Denver, in the *New York Sun*, "which needs nothing but its statement for its refutation."

This refutation will be helped on by a brief outline of the career of Mrs. Eddy. We take our facts from her "Retrospection and Introspection," and from articles of Mark Twain and J. M. Buckley

¹⁶ Page 8.

¹⁷ Page 8.

¹⁸ Page 461.

in the *North American Review*. Mary Morse Baker seems to have suffered from the "errors of mortal mind" at the very dawn of reason. When only eight years of age, she used to hear a voice that called her by name—Mary, Mary, Mary—three times in ascending scale. Even then she seems to have had a precocious belief that sound was an unreality, and neither quavers nor crotchets went up or down. For during twelve months Mary was "quite contrary," and gave no heed to the ascending scale. At last the example of little Samuel led her to pluck up courage enough to answer the voice. But the spell was broken; the voice was not such as had come to Samuel, it had nothing at all to say and was heard no more. Mary Morse Baker had little schooling; her father thought her brain too big for her body. She studied at home; but, after her discovery of Christian Science, strange to say, most of her knowledge "vanished like a dream." This singularly honest confession should be kept in mind by any one who reads the writings of Mrs. Eddy "in a purely critical vein," and without being prepossessed with and hampered by an irremediable bias to the side of her assumed infallibility. Since Mrs. Eddy's knowledge has all oozed out and "vanished like a dream," the topsy-turvy condition of the output of her fertile but poorly worked brain is no longer a secret. The dream—or ooze—theory is the key which unlocks and fully discloses that secret. Though in this wise bereft of knowledge, Mary was much comforted by matrimony. We can scarcely be persuaded that matrimony was not a reality to her. In 1843 she married Colonel Glover, of South Carolina. While "yellow fever was *raging*" in Wilmington, North Carolina, "the *insidious disease proved fatal*" to the Colonel. Strange that "an image in mortal mind," in nothing at all, should be so real as to be *insidious*, to *rage* and to *prove fatal* to an unreality like the Colonel! Surely Mrs. Eddy is now confessing "the errors of *her* mortal mind." It was after this first marriage that she thought Mary Morse Baker Glover would be too long; so the *Us* wished to drop a name. She took another instead, and erred egregiously by the unfortunate "image in mortal mind" which made her Mary Morse Baker Glover Patterson.¹⁹ Dr. Patterson was envious and naughty; he eloped with a married woman. A *real* divorce followed. In telling her fate our heroine seems, in very truth, almost to find consolation in a trifling *unreality*. She writes that her rival was "from one of the wealthiest families." We would say nothing at all about these romances and marriages had not the discoverer of Christian Science laid her private career bare before all who should read "Retrospec-

¹⁹ Mrs. Eddy does not name Dr. Patterson in "Retrospection and Introspection." We take his name from the other authorities already mentioned.

tion and Introspection." We do not wish to ridicule that private career, but to show how poorly it fits in with the theories of Christian Science. If matter is nothing, marriage is useless and absurd. We are at a loss to see how, at the age of sixty, in 1877, our much married founder of Christian Science so yielded to the reality of matter as to become Mary Morse Baker Glover Patterson Eddy. She has not married for twenty-seven years. She must have been "more than over shoes in love" with Mr. Eddy. To her last name there was too much of matter—too much of unreality—and some of its nothingness had to be lopped off or gouged out; it now reads Mary Baker G. Eddy.

Of course, this career never went on. Colonel Glover never was. Doctor Patterson did not elope. Mr. Eddy was only an "error of mortal mind," like the rest who had preceded him. Is not this a proper deduction from Mrs. Eddy's own principles? We do not wrong her. At least in this instance, she is quite true to her premises. Here is precisely what she says of the story of her life: "This is but the record of dreams, not of real existence."²⁰ Shall we allow a John-a-dreams to palm off hallucinations as revelations, Eddyism as Christianity? Eddyism is "such stuff as dreams are made on;" Christianity is not.

We say Eddyism is a dream, yet it has in it a dreadful reality. It starts out with no reality, but only a dream of Christ; it ends with no dream, but a painful reality of Mrs. Eddy—in fact, it is tantamount to worship of Mrs. Eddy.

She is the "be-all and end-all" of so-called Christian Science, its only reality. Her officials are merely puppets, led by a string and in one fixed groove. There are no preachers, no talkers—only readers—some of the Bible, the others of Mrs. Eddy's works. These readers are appointed by her, and may not make a word or comment on what they read. They and the whole society of Christian Scientists may, according to a special by-law, be excommunicated one and all, unheard, merely because of a whim of "this setter-up and plucker-down" of creeds. All knowledge has not oozed out of Mrs. Eddy. She knows full well how to put herself on a pedestal, how to lure the admiration, love and loyalty of men and women whose truth and sincerity she has blinded to her sham, and how to call forth from fifty thousand non-Catholics a homage and devotion greater far than the homage and devotion that it shocks most Protestants to find us Catholics rendering to the pure and immaculate, lowly yet powerful Virgin Mother of God.

Note well how Mrs. Eddy speaks of herself. She is in direct communication with God. "No human pen or tongue taught me

²⁰ "Retrospection and Introspection," page 27.

the Science contained in this book, and neither pen nor tongue can ever overthrow it."²¹ She does not blush to make for her form of religion that promise of indefectibility which Christ made for His. Why? Because her book is inspired. "It was not myself, but the divine providence . . . which dictated 'Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures.'" "I should blush to write of 'Science and Health, etc.,' as I have, were it of human origin, and I, apart from God, its author."²² She hints that she is "the woman" who will crush the serpent's head,²³ and the woman whom St. John tells us of in the twelfth chapter of the Apocalypse. "And there appeared a great wonder in heaven, a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet." In these words she finds "one distinctive feature which has special reference to the present age."²⁴ The "one distinctive feature" of Eddyism is Mrs. Eddy; in these words she finds Mrs. Eddy. Indeed, all the passages of Scripture that from the first centuries have been referred to our Lady, are now, after nineteen centuries of ignorance, found to pertain to this twentieth century Mary. She monopolizes the title Mother Mary, and fulminates a decree of excommunication against any one else who dares to take it. Even the angelic Ave and the beautiful Magnificat she misuses and mutilates. On May 20, 1890, she telegraphed to the National Christian Science Association that was assembled in New York these solemn words: "All hail! He hath filled the hungry with good things and the *sick* He has *not* sent away empty. Mother Mary." The real Mother Mary had said: "The *rich* hath He sent away empty." Mrs. Eddy mutilates the text, and her mutilation is received as inspired. The president of the association rises as its spokesman and places the false above the true Mother Mary, on a par with Jesus Himself. These are his words: "There *was* but one Moses, one Jesus; and there *is* but one Mary." He spoke not of the Mary that *was* with Jesus, but of the Mary that *is* without Jesus; and no one in that assembly wished or dared to contradict him.²⁵ No wonder! Has not their founder been blasphemous enough to claim to be equal with Jesus?²⁶ Does not she speak of herself as of "divine origin?" She says: "We shall claim no especial gift from our divine origin."²⁷

²¹ Page 4.

²² Cf. J. M. Buckley, in *North American Review*, vol. 173, page 24.

²³ Cf. "Unity of Good," page 57.

²⁴ Mark Twain, *North American Review*, December, 1902.

²⁵ Mark Twain, *North American Review*, April, 1903.

²⁶ Cf. *Christian Science Journal*, April, 1889; and Mark Twain, in *North American Review*, April, 1903.

²⁷ "Miscellaneous Writings," page 3.

We cannot, then, be surprised that some of her deluded votaries consider her the second Christ. Dr. George Tomkins says: "We consciously declare that 'Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures' was foretold, as well as its author, Mary Baker Eddy, in Revelation x. She is the 'mighty angel,' or God's brightest thought, to this age, giving us the spiritual interpretation of the Bible in the '*little book open*.' Thus we *prove* that Christian Science is the second coming of Christ."²⁸ This is a new meaning drawn from the words of St. John: "And I saw another mighty angel come down from heaven. . . . And he had in his hand a *little book open*."²⁹ Another devotee is just as plain spoken in acknowledging that Mrs. Eddy is the Christ: "My prayer is daily to be more spiritual, that I may do more as you would have me do. . . . May we all love you more, and so live that the world may know that the Christ is come."³⁰ There are many Christian Scientists as deluded as these two. Mark Twain says he has it on good authority that at one time the Mother Church of Boston had a picture of Mrs. Eddy before which a votive lamp burned night and day; and in this church the mural fresco texts on one side were from the New Testament and were irreverently attributed to J. C., while the texts on the other side were from "Science and Health," and were magnanimously assigned to Mrs. Mary Baker G. Eddy. I have been told that even to-day the same church has a stained glass window which portrays no saint, but Mrs. Eddy.

We have tried to work out what it is Mrs. Eddy means. To this end we have read, pondered over and quoted from her writings and those of many who hang upon her every word. We can find in her so-called Christian Science nothing much of science and a "little little less-than-little" of Christianity. Her science is no new invention, but an indigestible rehash of the Idealism and Pantheism that gained much favor among unbelievers until the latter day Materialists marshaled their forces. Her Christianity is Eddyism—the substitution of Mrs. Eddy for Christ. We feel that our conclusion will be admitted by any one who reads the works of Mrs. Eddy "in a purely critical vein;" and that, to the man of thought and prudence, the mere disclosure of the tenets of so-called Christian Science is a refutation of the un-Christian blasphemies and unscientific vagaries that Mrs. Eddy has sent a-masquerading over the world under the holy and noble guise of Christianity and of science. There is as much Christianity and science hid behind the mask of Eddyism

²⁸ Cf. Mark Twain, in *North American Review*, January, 1903.

²⁹ Cf. Apocalypse, 10, 1 and 2.

³⁰ *Independent Statesman*, March 9, 1897.

as there is in the following jingling lines that Mrs. Eddy borrows from some unknown author and prefixes to her text-book :

"I, I, I, I itself, I,
The inside and outside, the what and the why,
The when and the where, the low and the high,
All I, I, I, I itself, I."

WALTER M. DRUM, S. J.

Woodstock, Md.

LOUIS XIV. AND THE HOLY SEE.

1. *Histoire des désmeslez de la Cour de France avec la Cour de Rome au Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque de Bastia, publiés par L. X. P. Lucciana, 1888.*

2. *Deux documents inédits sur l'affaire des Corses à Rome, 20 Août, 1662. sujet de l'Affaire des Corses.*

Par M. l'Abbé Régner Desmarais. MDCCVII.

3. *L'Ambassade du Duc de Créqui, 1662-1665, par le Comte Charles de Moüy. Ancien Ambassadeur de France à Rome. Paris, 1893.*

4. *Louis XIV. et le Saint Siège, par Charles Gérin, Ancien Conseiller à la Cour d'Appel de Paris. Paris, 1894.*

THE discourtesy towards Pius X. of which the President of the French Republic was guilty in his recent visit to Rome is not, perhaps, very surprising on the part of the head of a government which has always been hostile to Catholicity, and the majority of whose subjects are apparently indifferent to matters of religion ; but it is, unfortunately, not the only occasion on which a Pope has been insulted in his capital by a ruler of France. Two of the most remarkable of these events occurred under the reign of Louis XIV., who, though priding himself on the title of Eldest Son of the Church, was led by his vanity to treat the Sovereign Pontiff with the same overbearing haughtiness and unscrupulous aggressiveness which he so often displayed in his dealings with other powers.

The pretext for the first of these invasions of the rights of the Holy See, which nearly plunged all Europe into a general war, was the attack made on the palace of the French Ambassador by the Corsican soldiers in the service of the Papal Government, infuriated by the insults they had received from members of the Ambassador's household, whose grooms and pages were noted as being still more turbulent than those of the other envoys accredited to the Vatican. The contempt which these troops of unruly followers openly displayed for the Papal authorities and the laws of the State was but the result of the feeling of impunity derived from the exorbitant privileges claimed by the Ambassadors, the most important of which was the right of asylum enjoyed not only by their palace, but also by all the surrounding houses, which became in consequence

the refuge of thieves and murderers and of every outlaw who sought to escape from justice. The Ambassadors insisted, moreover, on extending the same privilege to all those whom they authorized to place the arms of their sovereign over their doors, and they could even grant to a criminal a certificate that he belonged to their household and thereby preserve him from being arrested. As this protection was well paid for by those who received it, it formed a considerable source of revenue not only to the major-domo and the other servants of the Embassy, but sometimes even to the Envoy himself.

The Sovereign Pontiffs had protested repeatedly against these absurd and unjust pretentions, but at the death of each Pope his decrees and regulations seem to have passed away along with him, and his successor was under the obligation of again reënacting them. Thus in 1552 Julius III. had forbidden both the Roman nobles and the Ambassadors to usurp this right of granting an asylum to malefactors, which he denounced as a detestable abuse, and he declared that those who hindered the ministers of justice from entering their palace or from arresting criminals in the adjacent streets were guilty of high treason. This prohibition was renewed by Pius IV. in 1561, and Gregory XIII. in 1572, as well as Sixtus V. in 1585, reissued and confirmed these edicts. The well-known severity of the last named Pontiff seems to have checked the practice for some time, as no more decrees with regard to it appeared until the reign of Urban VIII., who, in 1626, repeated the previous denunciations with the addition of the punishment of death for all those who took refuge in the palace of a noble or of an Ambassador in order to escape from justice.

The evil, however, still persisted, and when, in the seventh year of the reign of Alexander VII. (1655-1677), during which space of time France had been represented in Rome only by Envoys of subordinate rank, Louis XIV. at last determined to send an Ambassador, the nobleman whom he selected came fully resolved to maintain this unjustifiable privilege and accompanied by a numerous retinue, composed of men who had served in the army and who were ready to seize on any occasion of creating a disturbance.

The courtier on whom the King's choice had fallen was Charles de Blanchefort de Bonne, Duc de Créquy and Prince de Poix, lieutenant general, first gentleman of the King's chamber and Knight of the Order of the Holy Ghost. He was more a soldier than a statesman, for he had commanded a corps of cavalry in Catalonia in 1645, and he had been wounded at the siege of Orbitello, in Tuscany, in 1646, while his diplomatic experiences merely consisted in a short mission to London in 1658 to congratulate Cromwell on the

victory won by the French and English troops over the Spaniards near Dunkirk, and to Spain in 1660 to bring the King's wedding presents to his future bride, Maria Teresa.

The Duke's contemporaries describe him as being a rough, haughty soldier, of an unyielding disposition, whose nomination to such an important post as that of Ambassador to Rome caused some surprise. The exaggerated idea which he entertained of his own importance and of the privileges to which he could lay claim was not diminished by the instructions which he received from the King, and the endless formalities of the extremely punctilious etiquette of the seventeenth century afforded him many occasions of offending the Papal Government. Thus, before leaving Paris for Rome, he refused to visit Mgr. Piccolomini, the Papal Nuncio, because it was not the custom for the Nuncio, while in his palace, to give the place of honor at his right hand to an Ambassador, and the Duke would have considered a place on the Nuncio's left hand as derogatory to his dignity. The Duke also demanded by the express orders of the King that, on his arrival in Rome, he should receive the visits of the Pope's brother, Don Mario Chigi, the Minister of War, and of his nephew, Don Agostino Chigi, Governor of the Castle of St. Angelo, instead of visiting them first—a pretension which was the origin of the bitter hostility which the Duke afterwards displayed towards the relations of the Sovereign Pontiff.

This point of precedence on which de Créquy pertinaciously insisted was not the only cause of the ill feeling which existed from the beginning of his embassy between the Holy See and Louis XIV. Another and a more dangerous source of discord was furnished by the King's desire to bring the States of Northern Italy under his influence, so as to counterbalance the power of Spain, which then possessed Milan and Naples, and two purely Italian questions, in which France had no right to interfere, gave him the opportunity he sought. The family of Farnese, which reigned at Parma, had many years previously mortgaged their Duchy of Castro and the town of Ronciglione, situated in the Papal States and held as a fief of the Holy See, but as they failed to pay the interest, Pope Urban VIII. had seized these estates in 1641, when the Camera Apostolica, or Papal Treasury, which became responsible for the debt, undertook to manage them and to satisfy the claims of the creditors. The lands were restored in 1642, and were again reoccupied by the Papal troops under Innocent X. in 1649, who allowed the Duke of Parma a delay of eight years to redeem them before they should be finally annexed. A further prolongation of this term for three years was granted by Alexander VII., but the Duke was still unable to pay, and Louis XIV., anxious to win him over

to his side, undertook to demand from the Holy Father the restitution of a property which the Papal Government had been fully justified in seizing.

The other matter in which the King of France had as little right to interfere was the claim put forward by the Duke of Modena to the town and lagoons of Comacchio, a dependency of the Duchy of Ferrara, which had also been held by the House of Este as a fief under the Holy See. On the death of Duke Alfonso II., in 1597, without direct heirs, Ferrara and Comacchio were incorporated with the Papal States by Clement VIII. as suzerain, while Modena was inherited by Cesar d'Este, Alphonso's illegitimate son, who, as well as his successors, persisted in laying claim to Comacchio as the property of his family.

The subordinate agents who, in the absence of an Ambassador, had since some years represented French interests in Rome, had always found the Sovereign Pontiff inflexible with regard to both of these questions, but Louis XIV. hoped that by means of a plenipotentiary of the rank of the Duke of Créqui he might at last persuade him to yield. The King reckoned also on the coöperation of the Spanish Government, which Cardinal Mazarin had sought to secure, by insisting on the insertion in the Peace of the Pyrenees (November 7, 1659) of two articles by which Spain was bound to support the King's demands; but Philip IV., who was not anxious to give any help to the ambitious projects of Louis XIV. with regard to Italy, found various pretexts for neglecting to perform his engagements, and the Dukes of Parma and Modena, who probably suspected what were the real motives of the zeal which their powerful protector manifested for their interests, did not show much alacrity in urging their claims.

The Ministers whom Louis XIV. had selected to assist him when, on the death of Cardinal Mazarin (March 9, 1661) he undertook the government of France as an absolute sovereign, and to whom he owed in a great measure the splendor of his reign, were Michel de Tellier, charged with the organization of the army; Jean Baptiste Colbert, as Minister of Finance, to which was afterwards added the administration of the navy, of the colonies, of the fine arts and of agriculture, and lastly, Hugues de Lionne as Secretary for Foreign Affairs. These statesmen, however, were, unfortunately, strongly imbued with Gallican principles, and to them must be attributed the spirit of hostility to Rome and the desire to humiliate the Holy See on every occasion which, according to Bossuet, was the policy which prevailed in the Council of Louis XIV.¹

As the King soon perceived that the order which he had given to

¹ Gérin, *Louis XIV. et la Saint Siège*, vol. I., p. 220.

the Duke de Créqui to demand that the Pope's nephews should visit him first was not likely to produce any other result than to render his Ambassador disagreeable to the Papal Court, he yielded at last and revoked it, but the Duke had already shown immediately after his arrival the spirit which animated him and with what jealous care he intended to maintain what he considered to be his privileges with regard to the right of asylum. A band of chained convicts on their way to the galleys was led one day by the police along the Via Giulia, which skirts the rear of the Palazzo Farnese, where the French Embassy was lodged, and shortly afterwards the police made a search in a house situated in the neighborhood. The Duke thereupon complained bitterly to the Papal Government of these encroachments on places under his jurisdiction, and when Mgr. Piccolomini, the Nuncio in Paris, sought to defend the evident right of the Sovereign Pontiff to cause the laws of the State to be executed in his capital, Hugues de Lionne replied insolently that Louis XIV. was the most susceptible Prince in the world, and the one whom it was most dangerous to offend, and that if he judged fit he could turn all Rome upside down.²

The Papal Government had already foreseen that the Duke de Créqui's household would probably cause some disturbance in the environs of his palace, and that more disorder might be expected on the arrival of Queen Christina of Sweden at the Palazzo Corsini, on the opposite bank of the Tiber, with an equally numerous and undisciplined crowd of attendants. The precaution was therefore taken of reinforcing the guard of Corsicans stationed close to the Church of La Trinità de Pellegrini, near the Ponte Sisto and the Palazzo Farnese, and it was raised to the number of 130 by drafts of picked men chosen from among the 800 Corsican soldiers then serving in various parts of the Papal States. The fact that Corsicans were at that time frequently employed in Italy to assist the *sbirri* or officers of justice when making an arrest or executing a sentence of the courts of law, may perhaps have been the reason why de Créqui's followers affected an insolent demeanor towards them whenever they met them and took pleasure in taunting them in the coarsest language with being merely spies of the police and not soldiers. More than once had the fiery Corsicans grasped their swords when insulted by the Ambassador's servants, who elbowed their way through them roughly as they stood talking together in front of their barracks; and, but for the timely intervention of their officers, they would have severely chastised their aggressors. In spite, however, of these incessant provocations, so great was the anxiety of the Papal authorities to avoid giving the foreign Amba-

² Regnier-Desmarais, p. 8.

sadors any cause of complaint, that the *sbirri* and the guard of soldiers which patrolled Rome every night had strict orders not to use their arms. The only result of this rather timorous prudence was to encourage the French to commit further outrages. Thus on the night of July 23 four men belonging to a patrol of forty Corsicans which had halted on the Piazza de Fiori entered a wine shop in the adjoining Piazza Farnese. They found there several members of de Créqui's household, and among others a fencing master named Papillon, notorious for his quarrelsome disposition, who, "heated with wine and rendered insolent by the neighborhood of the Ambassador's palace,"⁸ attacked them, disarmed them, wounded two of them and brought their swords and muskets back to the Palazzo Farnese. De Créqui returned the arms on the following day and sent the fencing master secretly out of Rome; but the soldiers were warned by their officers that in the future they should defend themselves, and a report was even spread that Don Mario Chigi on meeting some Corsicans shortly afterwards asked them if they did not know how to make use of their arms, threatening at the same time to send them to the galleys if they again allowed themselves to be beaten.

It was while the Corsicans were still smarting under this humiliating defeat and the reproaches of their superiors that occurred the untoward event which nearly led to open warfare between Louis XIV. and the Holy See.

About 7 o'clock in the afternoon of Sunday, August 20, three Corsican soldiers walking in the Via della Lungara on the side of the Tiber opposite the Palazzo Farnese met three Frenchmen wearing the Ambassador's livery, who insulted them with the usual opprobrious expressions, to which they merely replied: "We are not police spies, but soldiers of the Pope." Both parties then continued on their way, when the French suddenly turned and pursued the Corsicans sword in hand. The soldiers at once stopped, drew their weapons and drove their opponents back to the Ponte Sisto, where a crowd which had assembled separated them. The Frenchmen then crossing the bridge fell upon another Corsican and wounded him, but some more soldiers coming to his assistance made them fly towards the rear of the Palazzo Farnese, which is situated in the Via Giulia, and then returned to their quarters with their wounded comrade. The three Frenchmen apparently gave the alarm to the other grooms and footmen in the Ambassador's service, for about thirty of them, armed with pitchforks, swords and pistols, immediately rushed out of the palace in the direction of the bridge. On their way they met with two more Corsicans, one of whom escaped, while the other was driven into a shop and severely

wounded, but in the meanwhile news had reached the barracks that the Corsicans and the French had come to blows, that Corsican blood had been shed and that the French were coming to set fire to the barracks. The cry "to arms" was at once raised. The soldiers, anxious to avenge the insults which they had so long borne patiently, seized their muskets and dashed forward tumultuously, in spite of the efforts of the corporal of the guard to restrain them. Some of them even broke the bars of the gate, which he had closed, and forced their way through, leaving only about twenty men in the guard room. The captain of the company, who lodged in a neighboring street, hastened to the spot on hearing the uproar, and with the help of the lieutenant and sergeant succeeded in persuading the greater part of the soldiers to return to their quarters. About thirty or forty, however, still remained outside. Some of them wandered to and fro in the adjacent streets, where the terrified inhabitants had barricaded themselves in their houses, firing at random on any one whom they suspected of being French, while others opened fire on the Palazzo Farnese, and the Duke de Créquy, who came out on the *loggia* over the door, which still bears the trace of bullets, was in great danger of being killed. The Duchess de Créquy had been to visit the Church of San Bernardo at the Thermæ of Diocletian, and was returning, escorted by her pages and footmen, none of whom bore torches, but on hearing the shots she stopped her carriage at the corner of the Church of San Carlo di Catinari, and sent two footmen to inquire the cause of the disturbance. Some of the Corsicans fired upon them, but without touching them, whereupon the coachman immediately turned up a side street and drove to the palace of the Cardinal d'Este, but not before another shot had killed one of the pages. The mutiny was, however, soon at an end, for Don Mario Chigi took at once measures to restore order. Detachments of *sbirri* and of Italian and German troops were drawn up in the environs of the Palazzo Farnese, and the Cardinal d'Este, having armed his household, brought the Duchess back to her palace with a strong escort.

The Papal Government immediately sought to discover who were the perpetrators of this outrage against international law, as a result of which two persons had been wounded and eight shot dead or mortally wounded. A commission of Cardinals was named to decide what reparation should be offered to the King of France, and the police began to question the citizens who had witnessed the disturbance and the soldiers who had taken part in it. Some of the most guilty of the rioters had already escaped, but a price was put on their heads, and several were arrested in the Papal States or in Tuscany and lodged in the prisons of Rome.

The Duke de Créqui seems, however, to have come at once to the conclusion that this sudden outbreak of some hot-headed soldiers, exasperated by the provocation which they had received, was a premeditated outrage planned by the Ministers of the Pope, and especially by Don Mario Chigi, whom he had so long delayed to visit, and by Cardinal Imperiali, the Governor of Rome, who as head of the police was responsible for the arrests which had been made in the neighborhood of his palace. He therefore refused at first to see Cardinal Chigi, who wished to present to him the excuses of the Papal Government, and when he at last granted him an audience he received him coldly and informed him that the matter was no longer in his hands, but in those of the King. The Duke then, under pretext of defending himself against another attack, assembled 600 men in his palace in addition to the 200 who formed his household, laid in large stores of arms and ammunition and went through the city accompanied by a guard of 100 armed men. He was aided in these warlike preparations by Duke Cesarini, a Roman noble who was in the receipt of a pension from Louis XIV. and who wrote to the King offering to raise the people against the Pope, and pointing out to him that his estate at Ardea, in the Roman Campagna, would be a favorable situation for landing troops for the purpose of making an attack upon Rome.

The Papal Government requested de Créqui to disband his guards, but in vain; and as the citizens were much alarmed by this hostile garrison, which occupied such a strong position in their midst, and as several of the nobles, taking advantage of the general feeling of insecurity, began to arm their retainers, augmenting thereby the danger of further disturbances, more troops were brought into Rome and preparations were made for placing guard rooms near the French Embassy, while the Corsican soldiers were transferred to a distant part of the city. At last de Créqui, who was irritated by the slowness with which the inquiry into the outrage was being carried on, and who found that the other Ambassadors disapproved of his conduct, left Rome suddenly on September 1, without taking leave of the Holy Father, and went to reside at the town of San Quirico, in Tuscany.

From thence he wrote to the other Envoys in Rome stating that if the Sovereign Pontiff sincerely desired to offer satisfaction to the King he should, first, expel Cardinal Imperiali from the Sacred College; second, give Don Mario Chigi up to the King to do with him whatever he pleased; third, hang the captain, the lieutenant and the ensign of the Corsicans, together with fifty of their soldiers, on the Piazza Farnese; fourth, hang the bargello (or chief of the police) of Rome, with fifty of his *sbirri*, on the Piazza Navona, and fifth,

send a legate to France to offer an apology to the King in the name of the Holy See, and to declare that the Pope had had no share in the outrage and that he regretted that his Ministers should have been the cause of it.

It is only just to say that the demands which the King presented somewhat later were not so sanguinary as those of his Envoy; but the despatch in which the Duke informed His Majesty of the attack on the Embassy, and the expression of his conviction that it was made at the instigation of the relations of Alexander VII. and of Cardinal Imperiali, irritated the pride and the morbid vanity of Louis XIV. almost to madness. It also gave an additional stimulus to the animosity which his Ministers, and especially Hugues de Lionne, had always felt for the Holy See, and which is clearly shown in their correspondence regarding the mutiny of the Corsicans. The King, indeed, in a letter to de Créquy on October 13, 1662, was obliged to confess that he had then no proofs that the Cardinal had ordered the palace to be attacked, and that it would require much time to procure them, but still he asked that in the meanwhile the Cardinal should be imprisoned in the Castle of St. Angelo.

The first manifestation of the King's anger against Rome was the expulsion from Paris of Mgr. Piccolomini, the Papal Nuncio, who was ordered to withdraw to Meaux. He went instead to Saint Denis and then to a monastery at Gonesse, to each of which places he was followed by a guard of forty "*mousquetaires à cheval*," who watched him closely. He obtained, however, two audiences of de Lionne, in which he gave full explanations with regard to the outbreak of the Corsican soldiers, and before the second of these audiences took place, on September 9, at Suresnes, outside Paris, the King had received a letter from Alexander VII., in which the Holy Father expressed the grief which the attack on the Embassy had caused him, and Queen Christina of Sweden had written to de Lionne that the insolence of de Créquy's servants, not only towards the people, but also towards the Corsicans, was well known in Rome. She also assured him that the crime which the Corsicans had been driven to commit by these repeated insults had been neither instigated nor approved of by the Papal Government, and in a letter to Louis XIV., written at the same time, the Queen expressed the hope that he would not allow himself to be influenced and led astray by the passions or the interests of his Ministers. These assurances, however, had no effect either on the King or de Lionne, and it was in vain that Mgr. Piccolomini reminded the latter that the revolt had been immediately suppressed, the rioters imprisoned and steps taken to discover the guilty. He still remained, or pretended

to be, convinced that the Governor of Rome and the Pope's relations were responsible for the outrage.

The interview thus ended without producing any definite result, and two days afterwards the King, who showed great indignation on learning from de Créqui that he had left for Tuscany on account of more troops having been brought into Rome, ordered the Papal Nuncio to be expelled from France and to be conducted to the frontier of Savoy by a guard of soldiers.

The principal motive for the King's overbearing and insolent policy towards the Holy See was that he saw that he could find in this wholly unpremeditated outrage an opportunity of exciting public opinion against Rome, of humiliating the Papal Government and making it feel his power, and of forcing the Pope to grant him the concessions which he had hitherto vainly demanded—such as the restoration of Castro to the Duke of Parma, of Comacchio to the Duke of Modena and the right of nomination to three bishoprics situated in the provinces recently conquered from Spain. With the view, therefore, of making all necessary preparations in case he should think fit to declare war against the Holy See, Louis XIV. then began to treat with the King of Spain and the princes of Northern Italy in order to obtain leave for the passage of his troops through their States. It was a very embarrassing request. Its refusal might draw down upon them the vengeance of the most powerful sovereign in Europe, and if they acquiesced, they would not only be at war with the Pope and incur the censures of the Church, but might run the risk of losing their independence by the admission of French troops into Italy. Their resistance, however, did not last long. The King was far more powerful than the Pope; the danger of offending him was much greater, and every concession which he exacted was reluctantly made.

It would be tedious to enter into the details of the lengthy correspondence which took place between the King and the Holy See with regard to the satisfaction demanded for the attack on the Embassy. On the side of the King and his Ministers it consisted of a repetition of the same unjust and false accusations against the Pope and his relations of complicity in the outrage, for which no proof was forthcoming, and of threats intended to terrorize the Court of Rome and to constrain it to grant the King's demands. In reply to this insolent language the Papal Government could merely express its willingness to grant the King any reasonable satisfaction which he might require, while renewing the assurance that the outbreak of the Corsicans was wholly unpremeditated, and that it had been provoked by an aggression on the part of the French.

Finding that his threats produced no effect on the Papal Government, Louis XIV. proceeded to seize the town of Avignon and the Comtat Venaissin, a territory situated in Provence and belonging to the Holy See since three centuries. On September 30 the King's envoy, a cavalry officer, brought to Mgr. Lascaris, the Papal Vice Legate at Avignon, a peremptory order to dismiss his Italian troops, under pain of having the town invaded, alleging as a pretext that the Vice Legate had been fortifying the town and raising soldiers to increase the garrison; that he had allowed his subjects to speak disrespectfully of the King, and that he had impeded the free intercourse of the inhabitants of the State with their French neighbors. Mgr. Lascaris in reply pointed out that he could not disband his troops without orders from Rome, whereupon the partisans of France rose in rebellion and expelled them, tore down the Papal arms and replaced them by those of the King and besieged the Vice Legate in his palace. These outrages, it is true, were not approved of by Louis XIV., who did not wish to annex Avignon immediately, but merely to hasten the action of the Papal Court, and he therefore allowed the Vice Legate to remain still at Avignon and to govern in the name of the Pope.

The Papal Government had not as yet received any definite statement with regard to the conditions which the King would be likely to impose as satisfaction for the attack on the Embassy, and therefore hesitated to put forward any proposals; while on his side the King waited to see what he should be offered, in order to be able to exact further concessions, and he refused to take any notice of the three letters in which the Holy Father solemnly denied that his relations or his Ministers were in any way responsible for the crime of the Corsican soldiers.

At last, in the beginning of October, the Abbé Rospigliosi, nephew of the Cardinal of that name, who succeeded Alexander VII. in 1667 under the title of Clement IX., was sent to San Quirico to ascertain from the Duke de Créquy what terms he was instructed to demand, but as the Duke did not consider that the Papal Government had given its envoy sufficiently ample powers to treat, the abbé returned immediately to Rome.

He was replaced by Mgr. Rasponi, secretary to the Tribunal of the Consulta, a prelate with a high reputation for his sagacity, his tact and his disinterestedness. He was authorized to make the following concessions: The questions of Parma and Modena should be again examined; the guard rooms recently established near the Palazzo Farnese suppressed; Duke Cesarini was to be pardoned; the Corsicans should be forbidden by a Papal decree ever to serve the Holy See, and Cardinal Chigi should be sent to Paris as Legate

to offer an apology to the King. Before, however, stating these proposals, Mgr. Rasponi requested the Duke to state frankly what were the demands of the French Government, and the Duke then presented to him two sets of conditions, already drawn up by de Lionne, between which the Court of Rome was to choose. By the first it was required that Castro should be restored to the Duke of Parma and Comacchio to the Duke of Modena; that the privileges enjoyed by the Ambassadors should not be abolished without the consent of all the Cardinals; that the proceedings against Duke Cesarini should be stopped, and an indemnity granted to him; that the guards established in Rome since August 20 should be withdrawn, and an agreement made with the Duke de Créqui as to the ceremonies which should take place on his return to Rome. The alternate was that Don Mario Chigi should be banished to Sienna for six years; that Cardinal Chigi should come to Paris to offer an apology in the name of the Pope, and demand pardon for himself and all his family; that Cardinal Imperiali should be tried and expelled from the Sacred College; the bargello, or chief of the police of Rome, dismissed and banished, and that in commemoration of the outrage an obelisk should be erected in Rome with an inscription declaring that the Corsican nation was unworthy of ever bearing arms in the Papal service. Then followed articles referring to the proceedings against Duke Cesarini and all persons who had been prosecuted since August 20 for carrying arms; to the suppression of the guard rooms, and to the reception of de Créqui, as in the former series.

Even the King confessed, when forwarding these demands to his envoy, that it would be difficult to make them be accepted, and he added that even then there were many other concessions and favors, such as bishoprics and benefices for certain of his partisans, which he had often solicited without success, and which should be granted before anything was concluded.

Mgr. Rasponi, however, refused to concede more than what was contained in his instructions, and after several days of discussion the negotiations had made no progress. The Pope, indeed, and the Sacred College, to which in a consistory held on October 30 he had made known what he justly termed "the iniquitous demands" of Louis XIV., were willing to send Cardinal Chigi to Paris to enlighten the King as to the events which had taken place in Rome, but the Holy Father refused to give up Castro or Comacchio, as he considered himself bound by the decisions of his predecessors. He consented also to dismiss the bargello and to publish a Brief against the Corsicans, but he refused to sacrifice Cardinal Imperiali to the resentment of the King, as he knew him to be innocent.

By the advice, however, of the Council of State, Cardinal Imperiali, in order that he might not have to meet the Duke on his return, was given instead of the Governorship of Rome that of the Province of the Marches, a dignity which he resigned on the following day.

On being informed of this nomination, which he chose to consider as a fresh outrage against his sovereign, de Créquy wrote to the other Ambassadors that His Majesty was resolved to be revenged on Don Mario Chigi and Cardinal Imperiali, whom he looked upon as the enemies of his reputation and his glory, in such a way that the memory of it should serve as an example to posterity. He protested, however, that the King was ready to shed his blood for the Holy See, but that he made a distinction between the Pope and his relations and Ministers, who were seeking to shelter themselves under the cover of his authority. The Duke then broke off the negotiations, left San Quirico, and after a short stay at Sienna and Florence arrived at Leghorn on November 25 to embark for France.

The dread which the other Catholic States of Europe entertained of being drawn into a long and disastrous war with France rendered Louis XIV. assured of their neutrality and even of their complicity in the campaign which he was preparing against the Holy Father. It is true that Philip IV. of Spain protested strongly against a conflict which he foresaw would give great satisfaction to the French Huguenots, and refused to seize the Province of Beneventum, a possession of the Church situated in the Kingdom of Naples, but he yielded so far to the threats of Louis XIV. that he consented to allow the French troops to pass through the territory of Milan, while refusing the same permission to the soldiers levied for the Papal service in Germany and Switzerland.

The same weakness was shown by the Italian States, which gave way almost without resistance to the imperious demands of the King. The Republic of Venice, which Alexander VII., like so many of his predecessors, had so often assisted with men and money in its wars against the Turks, promised to furnish provisions to the French troops, and the Duke of Savoy agreed to allow them a free passage through his States. So did the Grand Duke of Tuscany, though he begged to be excused from entering into any alliance against the Holy Father; but the Republic of Genoa carried its servility to the King so far as to allow itself to be made the instrument of his vengeance against Cardinal Imperiali.

The Cardinal, hoping that his disappearance from public life might appease the King's irritation against the Sovereign Pontiff, had withdrawn to Genoa, where his family occupied a distinguished position; but the French Envoy, M. d'Auberville, having been in-

structed to ask if the Republic intended to take the Cardinal under its protection, the Senate gave orders for his immediate expulsion. The Cardinal, in disguise and followed by two servants, escaped at night from the soldiers sent to seize him, and hid himself in the neighborhood of Genoa. Driven again from thence, he fled by sea to Lerici, where he was nearly shipwrecked, and after many wanderings he found at last a refuge in a monastery in the Duchy of Massa and Carrara.

The departure of the Duke de Créqui had put a stop to the diplomatic relations between Rome and France, but Alexander VII., in his desire to bring the misunderstanding to an end, sought the intervention of the Venetian Ambassador in Paris, Aloise Grimani, and of Michael Iturietta, the secretary in charge of the Spanish Embassy. The Holy Father requested these diplomatists to present a letter to the King, in which he declared that he had refused no concession which could be granted without offending God or injuring the Holy See, and he expressed a desire to renew the negotiations at any place which the King might select. Louis refused to accept this letter, but he had been informed by persons in his pay in Rome that, in case there should be no other means of reopening the negotiations the Pope was willing to allow the questions of Castro and Comacchio to be brought forward and discussed. This decision on the part of Alexander VII. had been communicated at his request to Grimani and Iturietta by the Spanish and Venetian Ambassadors at the Vatican, but with strict orders not to reveal it unless they discovered that the King was resolved to return to the subject, when they might say that His Holiness was willing to give any suitable satisfaction, but without engaging the Pope in the matter decisively or compromising Venice and Spain. The King and his Ministers sought, therefore, to obtain from Grimani and Iturietta by threats of an immediate invasion of Italy a written document which might seem to proceed directly from the Pope and constrain him to allow these questions to be treated, while, if he disallowed the act of his representatives, he could be accused of dishonesty and faithlessness. Grimani and Iturietta did not suspect the snare which had been laid for them, and it was only after a long resistance and repeated assurances on the part of the French Government that its troops were about to enter Italy, that they consented to give in writing the declaration which was demanded of them.

Though the Sovereign Pontiff might well have found fault with the methods employed to oblige Grimani and Iturietta to give this promise, he confirmed it without hesitation. Mgr. Rasponi was again chosen as plenipotentiary, and in his credentials, dated March

23, 1663, it was stated that he was sent in consequence of the assurance given by Grimani and Iturietta that suitable satisfaction would be given with regard to the questions of Castro and Comacchio, and that the Pope, who had always desired what was equitable and becoming, would willingly concede whatsoever justice should require to be yielded and the guidance of an upright conscience would allow him to grant. De Créquì's instructions, on the other hand, ordered him to discuss last the most important question of all—namely, that of Castro; so that, in the words of de Lionne, the King might be at liberty to agree to the terms at any given moment or not, according as it suited his interests, and that when the other sovereigns of Europe learned that all the preceding demands had been agreed to, they would insist that the Court of Rome should yield also with regard to Castro.

The Duke de Créquì did not arrive at Lyons, where Mgr. Rasponi had already preceded him, until May 10, but after a few interviews the negotiations were suspended by order of the King, who objected to the title of Nuncio given to Mgr. Rasponi, as he was resolved not to receive a Nuncio in his kingdom until his demands had been fully satisfied; and he informed the Duke that it was his intention to treat the Court of Rome with harshness on every occasion and to mortify it in every way. His Majesty, therefore, decreed that the Papal Envoy should be expelled from France and go to reside at Pont-de-Beauvoisin, a village in Savoy close to the frontier, on the French side of which the Duke de Créquì took up his abode. The renewed discussion did not last very long, for when the question of Castro came to be treated, as the Duchy had been legally forfeited to the Holy See by the neglect of the Duke of Parma to pay his creditors, and as the Pope considered himself bound by oath not to alienate the property of the Church, Mgr. Rasponi could only consent in his name to submit the matter to the Tribunal of the Rota or to a congregation of Cardinals. On referring to Rome his decision was confirmed, and the conference was brought to an end on July 1, M. de Créquì threatening that when the King invaded Italy he would demand still greater concessions, and as soon as Louis XIV. was informed of the non-success of the negotiations he made every preparation for the invasion of the Papal States.

He began by sending an advance guard of 1,500 infantry and 2,400 cavalry into the Duchies of Parma, Modena and Montferrat; and to justify this step he had the dishonesty to inform the Spanish Government that he considered himself bound to protect his allies from an incursion of the Papal army, though the Duke of Parma and the Duchess Regent of Modena had protested that they were

in no want of protection, since they apprehended no danger from Rome, and they added that as that year's harvest had been bad, the maintenance of a body of foreign troops would impose a serious burden on their subjects. The King, however, insisted, promising to furnish provisions for his soldiers and the rulers of the Duchies were obliged to submit. This anxiety for the welfare and independence of Parma and Modena can be well explained by the fact that in the previous month of February the King had caused the Duke of Parma to be informed that in case he succeeded in obtaining the restoration of the Duchy of Castro he hoped that the Duke would solemnly promise to devote himself forever to his interests and to conform in everything to his will.

Louis then completed the annexation of Avignon and the Comtat Venaissin, by ordering the Parliament of Provence to draw up a decree to that effect, which M. d'Oppède, the first President of that assembly, presented to the Vice Legate on July 7. On the refusal of Mgr. Lascaris to consent to this unjust seizure of the territory of the Holy See, he was expelled from Avignon and escorted by soldiers to Nice in the States of the Duke of Savoy.

The advanced guards of the French army were soon quartered in the Italian Duchies, in spite of the ill will of the sovereigns and of the people, which the latter manifested by frequent assassinations of French soldiers; and towards the end of December the number of troops which were to form the expedition was fixed at 26,000 infantry, 7,000 cavalry and 16 guns. At the same time, however, the King consented to allow the Abbé de Bourlamont, auditor of the Tribunal of the Rota and one of the secretaries of the French Embassy in Rome, to renew the negotiations on the condition that if they were not concluded by February 15 the Papal States should be invaded. It was in vain that the Sovereign Pontiff appealed for help to the Emperor of Germany, the King of Spain and the various States of Italy. The Emperor was scarcely able to defend Germany from the repeated onslaughts of the Turks; Spain, weakened by the recent war with France, was engaged in a disastrous struggle with Portugal, which Louis, in spite of the stipulations of the Treaty of the Pyrenees, was secretly helping with men and money; and the Italian princes were powerless in presence of the overwhelming military superiority of France. The Holy Father, therefore, after having consulted the College of Cardinals, again despatched Mgr. Rasponi to represent him in the renewed negotiations. They took place at Pisa, and there on February 12, 1664, was concluded a treaty of which the following were the principal articles: The Duchy of Castro was to be given up by the Papal Treasury and the Duke of Parma allowed a further delay of eight

years to pay off the charges; the Duke of Modena was to receive an indemnity for the Lagoons of Comacchio; Cardinal Chigi was to go to France to make a humble apology to the King, while his father, Don Mario, should give his word of honor that he was not responsible for the outrage of August 20, and Cardinal Imperiali should appear before the King to justify himself. The bargello of Rome was to be banished; the entire Corsican nation declared unworthy of ever serving the Holy See, and an obelisk bearing an inscription to that effect erected opposite their barracks. The King in return promised to restore Avignon and the Comtat Venaissin to the Pope, who, on his side, consented to grant an amnesty to the persons who had revolted at the time of the annexation, as well as to annul all proceedings against Duke Cesarini and some other Roman nobles, and to compensate the Duke for whatever losses he might have sustained.

Such were the humiliating conditions which the pride and ambition of Louis XIV. imposed on Alexander VII., who, on February 18, deposited in the Archives of the Vatican an eloquent protest against the violence to which he had been subjected. After stating that the questions of Castro and Comacchio had nothing to do with the attack on the Embassy, the Pope recalled the threats by which the King had sought to intimidate him; the seizure of Avignon and the Comtat Venaissin, whose inhabitants had been encouraged to rebel, and the occupation of the Duchies of Parma and Modena by the advanced guard of the army which was to invade the Papal States. The Holy Father then mentioned the vain efforts he had made to obtain help from the Emperor, the King of Spain and the Italian Princes, and he declared that if he had yielded it was simply in order to avoid the misfortunes which a war against so powerful a sovereign as the King of France would have brought upon Italy at a time, especially, when Christendom was in the utmost danger from the Turks, who had invaded Candia, who were threatening Dalmatia and Friuli, and who were about to begin another campaign against Hungary.

The Court of Rome performed faithfully the conditions imposed upon it. The Corsican soldiers were disbanded and sent home, and though the Papal Government requested the King to be satisfied with the commemoration of the outrage by means of a slab affixed to the wall of the Palazzo Farnese, His Majesty insisted on the construction of a solidly built obelisk guarded by a railing in front of the Corsican barracks, and bearing an inscription stating that in execration of the odious crime committed by the Corsican soldiers against the Ambassador of the most Christian King, the Corsican nation had been declared by a decree of Pope Alexander

VII. incapable of serving the Apostolic See. It is true that in 1668, under the reign of Clement IX., the King consented to allow this monument to be destroyed, but its memory must have been recalled to the minds both of the French and the Romans, when, less than a century and a half later, a Pope assisted at the installation of a Corsican soldier on the throne of the Bourbons.

Cardinal Chigi came to France, as it had been stipulated, and was received by the French people with enthusiasm, and by the King at Fontainebleau with the splendor and ceremony which distinguished the French Court; but the Parliament of Paris, well known for its Gallican opinions, raised many objections to his reception in Paris, to which at last it had to consent, and His Eminence found that during his journey through France his correspondence with Rome was intercepted and his letters opened.

Avignon and the Comtat Venaissin, the people of which had been given to understand that they were definitively annexed to France, were restored to the Holy See, and Louis, who, for the furtherance of his unscrupulous policy, had driven them to revolt, was now obliged to revoke the decree of the Parliament of Provence and reinstate the Vice Legate and the Papal garrison. But in order to manifest as much ill will as possible, while apparently conforming to the Treaty of Pisa, the King refused to permit the construction of a citadel at Avignon which could control the town, and he would not even allow the Vice Legate to fortify his palace so as to enable it to withstand a popular outbreak.

The Duke de Créquy came back to Rome as Ambassador, and the King kept him there for some time; but after the events which had taken place he could not hope to be treated by the Vatican otherwise than with coldness and mistrust, and the Pope when transacting any business with the Court of France, preferred to ignore his presence in Rome and to employ the Papal Nuncio in Paris as his intermediary. The Duke was at last recalled at his urgent and often repeated request, and with his departure, on April 24, 1665, the humiliation and insults inflicted by Louis XIV. on the Sovereign Pontiff in revenge for the unpremeditated attack on the French Embassy were brought to an end.

DONAT SAMPSON.

London, England.

THE "HIGHER CRITICISM."

THE science of the "Higher Criticism" of the Bible, which is a help to believers in Holy Writ, has been used as a weapon of destruction by unbelievers in Divine revelation. Catholics firmly hold that all the parts of the books of Holy Scripture have been written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and they accept them on the infallible authority of the Catholic Church, "which is the pillar and ground of truth;" whereas Protestants depend for their belief in the Sacred Books on historical arguments and on ancient tradition. The many Rationalists of to-day, who hold neither to the authority of a church or to tradition, look on the Sacred Scriptures as merely human documents, and criticize them freely by means of modern scientific methods. The arch-rationalist Renan when writing about the Bible declared that until a new order of things prevailed he would hold the principle of historical criticism that a supernatural account cannot be allowed, as it always implies credulity or fraud, and that the duty of the historian is to seek to find out what amount of truth or falsehood it may contain. He and his German fellow-unbelievers do not allow the Sacred Scriptures to be a truthful historical record or to be the inspired Word of God, and they have devoted their extensive learning and their time to a searching critical inquiry into the nature, the origin and the truthfulness of the Old and New Testaments. They have loudly proclaimed to the world that many of the historical statements of the Bible are unfounded and are purely mythical, and that the Sacred Book is full of historical mis-statements and contradictions. The same spirit of skepticism which had rejected the early history of Greece and Rome now sought to show that the Sacred Writings were only a confused collection of fabulous legends. When a new world was discovered through the unwearied labors of archæologists and the inscriptions on the monuments of the ancient Eastern empires of Assyria, Babylon and Egypt were one by one deciphered, and men stood face to face with the contemporaneous records of the times of Abraham and Moses, then their joy was unbounded at the utter destruction, as they fondly hoped, of the Bible myths by the brilliant light that thus was suddenly thrown upon them through the finding of those long-buried treasures of Eastern history. But happily the newly-discovered heathen records have corroborated in a wonderful way the truthfulness of the Holy Scriptures, and archæology has undone the work of those apostles of the "Higher Criticism."

The arrogance of the tone of those scientific skeptics indeed had already aroused distrust amongst scholars whose minds were not swayed by hatred of divine revelation, and their unfounded theories now crumbled into dust before these newly-discovered records of the past in the Babylonian libraries and the Egyptian tombs and temples. A more cautious, impartial and logical spirit has taken the place of scientific skepticism, and when the spade of Schliemann had brought to light the long-buried Empire of Agamemnon it became evident to every one that the higher critics were at fault, and that their destructive arguments were little better than sophisms, which had for their foundation only "a little learning." The reconstruction of early Greek and Roman history was followed shortly afterwards by the discovery of the ancient history of the East; and then, to the dismay of the "higher critics," it was clearly seen that the truth of the Bible history was upheld by the new discoveries of the Eastern archæologists.

As soon as the cuneiform inscriptions which were engraved in the Persian, Scythian and Babylonian languages on the sacred rock of Behistun were deciphered by the patient skill of German, French and English archæologists, the key was obtained for unlocking the treasures of historical knowledge which were hidden hitherto in the ancient monuments of the East, and then a deadly blow was struck at the higher critics of the Bible; for the historical statements made by those Babylonian and Assyrian inscriptions were found to be in full agreement with the Bible narrative. And when the hieroglyphic writings on the ancient Egyptian monuments were rightly interpreted through means of the deciphered inscriptions on the Rosetta stone, which had both Greek and Egyptian characters inscribed upon it, a flood of light was thrown upon the truthfulness of the sacred books.

Much of the criticism that has been lavished in such great abundance on the sacred writings was founded on the assumption that the ancient Oriental world was inferior in civilization and culture to the modern world of Europe. The higher critics took it for granted that no literature existed in those early times in the East; that the art of writing was almost wholly unknown, and that every statement which implied the existence of civilization should be put aside as mythical and legendary. The story of the marching of great Babylonian and Assyrian armies into far-off Palestine was declared to be a foolish fable, as such great undertakings were impossible from the want of highways and the means of transporting such large numbers of men through wild and savage wastes; and thus it came to pass that the authenticity and the truthfulness of the Sacred Scriptures were treated with contempt and laughed to

scorn. But we know now from the contemporaneous records of the ancient monuments that have been unearthed, with patient labor, from the mounds, which alone remain of the splendid cities of Babylon, Persia and Assyria, that such events took place in the days of the Jewish patriarchs and prophets, and that the ancient Eastern world enjoyed a very high degree of civilization and of literary culture.

We can now see with our own eyes, through the excavations that have been made in many parts of Greece, Cyprus and Asia Minor that the dim tradition of a cultured age at Mycenæ and at Troy was founded on fact, and we can trace the intercourse of the highly civilized Grecian races with the North and the East, with the Egyptians and the Phœnicians. We also learn that the heroic age of Greece was an age of civilization and of culture. We know, too, from the lately discovered inscriptions and cuneiform tablets at Tel-el-Amarna, on the banks of the river Nile, that the peoples of Western Asia at the time of Moses were as highly cultured as the Greeks and the Romans were when their prosperity was at its highest.

The iconoclasm of the critical school of historians had done its worst when the pages of history which had seemed to be lost forever were restored, the veil was lifted which had concealed for so many centuries the records of the past, and the explorer and decipherer gave us back the ancient documents of the great empires of the East. Twenty years ago we possessed only scraps and fragments of ancient history, and the Bible alone gave a full account of those olden times; but, as it stood alone, it was looked upon by scientific historians as legendary and untrustworthy. The libraries of Babylon and Assyria, however, have been discovered, and we have learned at length that the Eastern nations then were as civilized and as cultured as the world of to-day, and that the arrogant assumptions of the critical historians were founded mostly on imperfect evidence and on ignorance of ancient history.

A dead world has come to life through the spade of the excavator and the patient labor of the decipherer; and through the finding of the monuments of Egypt, Babylon and Assyria we find ourselves face to face with Sargon, Sennacherib, Nabuchodonosor and Cyrus, and we can follow the march of their victorious armies. These wonderful discoveries have thrown a flood of light on the ancient world of the East, and have in a wonderful way corroborated and elucidated the Bible narrative.

A few examples will show how these lately discovered monuments of past ages coincide with Bible history, and serve to overthrow the skeptical teaching of the apostles of the "Higher Criticism."

It is stated in the Book of Genesis that Abram the Hebrew, who dwelt in the vale of Mambre, having by a night attack defeated Chordorlahomor and his army in the vale of Save, "Melchisedech, the King of Salem, bringing forth bread and wine, for he was the priest of the most high God, blessed him and said: Blessed be Abram by the most high God who created heaven and earth" (ch. xiv.).

The higher critics declared that this story of the priest-king of Salem, standing alone and unsupported by any document of antiquity, was unhistorical and altogether unworthy of credence. An account of a priest-king of Salem has been discovered, however, on the tablets of Tel-el-Amarna, in Egypt, and his resemblance to Melchisedech, the King of Salem and priest of the most high God, whom the critics considered to be a purely mythological personage, is so great that, although he lived in later times, the plea of historical and archæological impossibility falls to the ground. A tablet was discovered a few years ago at Tel-el-Amarna on which was inscribed a letter from Ebed-tob, the vassal King of Salem (Jerusalem), to his lord and King Pharaoh of Egypt. He writes: "Behold neither my father nor my mother have exalted me in this place; the arm of the Mighty King has caused me to enter the house of my father. Behold I am an ally of the King, and I have paid the tribute, even I. Neither my father nor my mother, but the arm of the Mighty King established in the father's house." We learn thus from an inscribed document that is older than the Book of Exodus that the history of the meeting of the Patriarch Abraham and the priest-king of the sacred city of Salem—the city of peace—was in the fullest accordance with the circumstances of the time and country.

The protagonists of the Higher Criticism of the Bible, having found out that a word which is of much later date than the time of Solomon is used in the Canticle of Canticles (Song of Songs), held therefore that this beautiful poem was a forgery of later times. But a small hoematite weight was discovered lately at the site of the ancient city of Samaria, on which are inscribed characters of the eighth century before Christ, and amongst them occurs this word, "Shel." The critics at first denied the genuineness of the inscription, and then the reading of it; but at length they wisely sought refuge in silence.

The Prophet Isaias warned the Jews that a visitation should come upon them from afar; that they should be bound down under the bond and be slain, and that the Assyrian would be the rod and staff of the wrath of God; but he consoled them with the promise that when the Lord should have performed all His works in Mount

Sion and in Jerusalem, He would set His hand to possess the remnant of His people which should be left from the Assyrians and from Egypt, and would set up a standard unto the nations and gather together the fugitives of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Israel from the four quarters of the earth. Catholic commentators on Holy Scripture have been puzzled by this passage of the Book of Isaías. Knabenbauer in his learned book on the prophecies of Isaías writes: "What is the meaning of this description of the Assyrian invasion? Is it a true prophecy or a mere poetic fable, as recent writers affirm it to be?" and he answers that this prophecy was a vision, which though literally or symbolically true for the most part, must not be taken as a correct historical description of what really happened when the armies of Sennacherib poured down their destructive torrent on the fertile plains of Palestine. Modern scientific historians scoff at the whole of the tenth and eleventh chapters of the Book of Isaías, where the prophecy of the Assyrian invasion is given, and they declare that the events predicted by the prophet never took place and are wholly destitute of any historical foundation. We know now from the many Assyrian monuments that have been brought to light in recent years that whilst the inspired prophet was announcing those awful woes to the sinful Jews the army of an Assyrian King was marching from the north upon Jerusalem; that the sacred city was sacked and burned, and that the noblest citizens, with their wives and families, were dragged into captivity, a remnant alone remaining. The history of this Syrian invasion has been found in the libraries of Babylon, and the history of the Egyptian invasion which Isaías had prophesied at the same time has been found written in hieroglyphics on the walls of the ruined temple of Karnak, where the Egyptian King is pictured as striking down with a colossal club the conquered Hebrews. The contemporaneous cuneiform inscriptions of Babylon and Nineveh tell us that Sargon, the father of Sennacherib, invaded Judea and captured Jerusalem; and the truthfulness and trustworthiness of the inspired prophet has been fully vindicated. The Assyrian King Sargon had many inscriptions giving the history of his warlike deeds engraven on the walls of his palace near Nineveh, and we learn from them that whilst fighting himself against the King of Babylon his commander-in-chief invaded Judea, took Samaria and Jerusalem, made captives the mighty of the land and men fit for war, leaving the peasants to till the soil and pay tribute to the Assyrian monarch. He made a treaty of peace with Pharaoh, King of Egypt, and with Samsé, Queen of the Arabs, and described himself proudly on his monuments as "The conqueror of the widespreading plains of Judea." He then was

solemnly enthroned at Babylon as the adopted son of Bel and the successor of the ancient Babylonian Kings. Having been murdered the following year, his son Sennacherib succeeded to his mighty throne. Those Scripture interpreters who had been forced unwillingly to look upon the Assyrian invasion mentioned by *Isaias* as "ideal," have learned now from Assyrian and Babylonian monuments that it was a reality, and the scientific critics of the Bible have seen another weapon against the sacred writings broken in their hands.

The Holy Scriptures often speak of the ancient kingdom of the Hethites (or Hittites). The Canaanite who betrayed his fellow-citizens to the Israelites dared not stay in his native land, but fled away "into the land of Hethim" (*Judges* i., 26). Solomon bought horses from "Egypt and Coa and from all the Kings of the Hethites" (*III. Kings* x., 28), and when God sent a panic amongst the Syrian army as it lay encamped before the city of Samaria "they said one to another: Behold the King of Israel has hired the Kings of the Hethites against us" (*IV. Kings* vii., 6). This great Hethite nation is mentioned also in other parts of the Holy Scriptures.

The apostles of the "Higher Criticism," however, asserted that the Hittite nation never existed in the East, since no record of them has come to us, and they considered the frequent mention of them in the writings of the Old Testament to be a strong proof of the unhistorical and mythical character of the sacred books. But numerous records of that powerful nation have been discovered in many place of Asia Minor and at Babylon within the last few years, and through the unwearied labors of indefatigable explorers we have learned about the intercourse which was carried on between the princes of Greece and the Egyptian, Phœnician and Hittite nations. Modern excavations and the successful deciphering of cuneiform and hieroglyphic inscriptions has brought to light again this ancient race which was most powerful at one time in the East. The reasonings of the critics have come to naught, for the stones cry out against them.

We have learned from the Egyptian inscriptions at Tel-el-Amarna and elsewhere that the Kings of Egypt had fierce struggles with the Hittite nation and that Ramses II., who is thought to be the Pharaoh who oppressed the Jews, was glad to make peace with them; that peace was ratified by the marriage of the daughter of the Hittite King with the Egyptian monarch, and the terms of the treaty of peace, which still exists engraven on stone, make known to us the greatness of the Hittite kingdom. "The King was in the city of Ramses on that day. Then came forward the ambassador of

the King and presented the ambassadors of the great King of the Hittites who were sent to propose friendship to the King Ramessu Mi-Aman, the dispenser of life eternally." The terms of the treaty, which were written on a silver tablet, are then given at great length on the Egyptian's monument.

The Hittite nation, which existed before the exodus of the Jews from Egypt, grew little by little until it became one of the most powerful nations of the East. It carried its arms, its art and its religion to the shores of the Ægean Sea, and as Professor Sayce writes, the early civilization of Greece and Rome owes much to it. The Hittite kingdom stretched at one time from Carchemish, on the river Euphrates, to Kadesh, on the Orontes, near the Mediterranean Ocean, and it continued until the invasion of Asia Minor and Judea by the armies of the Assyrian King Rammon-nirari III. This great King recounts his warlike achievements on his monuments in this wise: "As far as the shores of the great sea at the rising of the sun, from the banks of the Euphrates, the land of the Hittites, the land of the Amorites to its farthest bounds, the land of Tyre, the land of Sidon, the land of Nuri, the land of Edom, the land of the Philistines as far as the shores of the great sea at the setting of the sun, I subjected to my yoke, tribute and gifts I imposed upon them." The Hittite nation gradually grew weak and became a prey to the neighboring nations and for many thousands of years their name and fame were known only through the Bible records; but this great nation which had played so important a part in the history of the Eastern world has been made known to us now by the lately discovered monuments of the East.

An amusing example is given in the interesting book on "Ants and Bees" by Sir John Lubbock, which shows how ignorant and narrow-minded are some of the skeptical professors of the "Higher Criticism." Those learned men unanimously held at one time that the statement which is made by King Solomon in the Book of Proverbs that "the ant provideth her meat for herself in the summer, and gathereth her food in the harvest," was contrary to fact, since it had been observed repeatedly by most careful scientists that ants do not hoard up grain or any other food for future use. This statement of those learned opponents of the Bible is true undoubtedly of the ants that live and thrive in the northern countries of Europe, for there they never store up food of any kind during the time of harvest, but "it is now," as Sir John Lubbock asserts, "a well-established fact that more than one species of southern ants do collect seeds of various sorts." The statement of King Solomon has been verified and confirmed since by travelers in the East. "Sykes in his account of an Indian ant appears to have been the

first of modern authors to confirm the statements of Solomon. He states that the above-named species collects large stores of grass seeds, on which it subsists from February to October. On one occasion he even observed ants bringing up their stores of grain to dry them after the closing thunderstorms of the monsoons. It is now known that harvesting ants occur in the warmer parts of Europe, where their habits have been observed with care." It is evident, therefore, that Solomon was right, and that the Bible critics were wrong in this matter, as they were in very many other Scriptural questions wherein they spoke contemptuously of the narrative of the sacred writers.

The heathen records of the past that have been discovered of late years beneath the mounds of Babylon and Nineveh, on the clay tablets of the buried city of Kowyunjik and on the ancient monuments of Egypt and Cyprus have been found to agree with and to corroborate in a wonderful way the historical statements of the sacred writers. "Who would have believed it probable or possible," writes Layard, "before these discoveries were made, that beneath the heap of earth and rubbish which marked the site of Nineveh, there would be found the history of the wars between Hezekiah and Sennacherib, written at the very time when they took place by Sennacherib himself, and confirming, even in minute details, the Biblical record? He who would have ventured to predict such a discovery would have been treated as a dreamer or an imposter."

The Bible, as a great scientific scholar said, coming as it does from the hand of God, awaits securely the progress of knowledge. It watches with unconcern the unearthing of the lore of a buried world, and it rejoices with every inscribed stone and storied cylinder that is discovered amongst the ruins of ancient cities. It hails as so many witnesses to its truthfulness every deciphered monument and hieroglyphic slab. It fears not the light, but only the darkness of ignorance, and it calmly abides the fulfilment of the predictions which divine inspiration has written on its sacred pages. If men of science were also filled with the spiritual gifts of wisdom and holiness, both learning and religion would profit alike.

ALBERT BARRY, C. SS. R.

TIBETAN BUDDHISM AND CATHOLICITY.

RECENT travel in Central Asia has shown among other things that the statistics of the religions of the far East require considerable revision. The number of Buddhists, for example, has been grossly exaggerated, and the popular error that Buddhism is the religion of China is very difficult to uproot.

M. Grénard, whose recently translated book on "Tibet and the Tibetans"¹ is one of the most valuable and scientific works on that strange country which has yet been published, says he knows only two nations whose national religion is Buddhism, viz., Mongolia and Tibet; and the combined population of these two countries does not amount to more than six millions. There are, of course, a good many Buddhists in China and in India, but Buddhism is not the national religion of either of these countries. Confucianism is by far the most predominant of the three religions of China, Taoism, or demon worship, and Buddhism being the other two, and according to Mrs. Bishop (Isabella Bird) they are so mixed up with each other that there is little antagonism between them, but Confucianism remains the strongest religious force in the Celestial Empire, while Brahminism is the religion of nine-tenths of the Hindoo population, cradle though India be of Buddhism.

At present Tibet is as much the stronghold, the centre, the home of Buddhism as the Eternal City is of Christianity; but Lamaism, or Tibetan Buddhism is, as M. Grénard explains, a very different religion from that founded in India by Sakya-muni, the Light of Asia. Catholicism and the most extreme Protestant sects are not wider apart than the original Buddhism of the Enlightened One and Lamaism. Buddhism as taught by Sakya-muni was too elevated, too spiritual for the Tibetans; for pure Buddhism is a religion only for the few; for those who are content to practise absolute self-renunciation; to forsake the world and all its pleasures and devote themselves to a life of contemplation, not with the hope of obtaining individual happiness as their reward, but merely that an increase of general happiness may result from their self-denial and good works.

This high doctrine did not commend itself to the Tibetan mind, nor can we wonder that it did not; for the natural cravings of the human soul for the bread of eternal life are not to be satisfied with the stone of Nirvana. Nevertheless, erroneous as Sakya-muni's teaching was, it is idle to deny that his doctrine of self-

¹ "Tibet and the Tibetans," F. Grénard, 1904. Hutchinson. "The Yangtze Valley and Beyond," Mrs. Bishop, 1899. Murray.

renunciation was a very high ideal; in fact, it is a perversion of the highest Christian asceticism. The Christian ascetic renounces the world and his own will to do the will of God for the sake of the love of God; the Buddhist ascetic renounces the world and his own will for the love of his fellow-man, that the world may be the better for his self-renunciation in some remote way. The Tibetans could not understand Sakya-muni's teaching, hence their form of Buddhism is very corrupt. They borrowed a host of Hindoo divinities, whom they fear and endeavor to propitiate by a continuous round of superstitious practices and idolatrous worship rather than to tread the mystic path which is supposed to lead to Nirvana. Originally Buddhism was devoid of worship; its votaries devoted themselves to the deepest contemplation, sitting absolutely motionless, wrapped in the most profound meditation; but Tibetan Buddhism consists in endless rites and ceremonies, prostrations, turning prayer-wheels, waving flags and streamers covered with prayers, muttering one short mystic sentence, the Buddhist formula, "*Om mani padmé hum,*" ten thousand times a day, dancing, spinning, saying their rosaries, walking in processions, going on pilgrimages, entertaining all the gods one day and all the devils another at banquets, swallowing pills made of relics supposed to be indulgences, wearing amulets and charms and practising all kinds of witchcraft, exorcisms and magic.²

They dance mad sarabands, M. Grénard says, to expel the devil, and are constantly spinning round sacred mountains, lakes and heaps of stones covered with prayers, which are found all over the country, all travelers contributing a stone to every heap they pass. This spinning appears to be a relic of sun worship, for they always turn in the direction of the sun. Then they have grafted the ancient religion of the worship of ancestors, derived from China, onto Buddhism, in which originally it had no place. Once a year a great feast in honor of the departed is kept, when they make offerings to the shades of their ancestors, who receive the title of gods.

The popular idea of the Buddhist doctrine of the transmigration of souls is incorrect; it is not the passing of a soul into another body and a continuation of the personality after death. The original doctrine of metempsychosis as defined by M. Grénard is "that the soul is a series of psychic acts and attributes and that after death these psychic facts continue to subsist and influence the entire life of the world by entering into new combinations." This, however, is "caviare to the general," and is only held by the most learned and

² "Tibet and the Tibetans," by M. F. Grénard.

most distinguished teachers. Buddhists in general have come to believe that the souls of the departed come to life in a different form without remembering their former state. The form the next incarnation will take is determined by the conduct during life.

Tibetans, however, will have none of this teaching, either in its highest or in its popular form. They insist that the souls of their departed relations shall go as straight to the western paradise as prayers, incantations, alms and various rites can send them, and accordingly the lamas who make a fine market out of this preferential belief are obliged to yield to the popular feeling and act upon it.

They therefore visit the dead person and pray by his bedside and celebrate a service in the temple for his soul, while the relations give large alms to the poor and to the priests, believing it will help the soul to paradise. The lamas give the corpse a scarf of honor, the usual Tibetan gift prescribed by etiquette, and exhort him on no account to come back to the world, but to follow the very elaborate directions they give him concerning the road to paradise. The Tibetan people have a great dread of a dead person returning to earth, and for forty-nine days after death they place food on his grave to support him on his journey. This is a very ancient custom, and is described in Tibetan books of the seventh century. They dress up a block of wood in the deceased person's clothes, put his portrait on the top and place it on his tomb. The portrait is finally burnt and the ashes mixed with earth and made into a sort of cone, which is kept on the altar that finds a place in every Tibetan house.

Every family has a special divinity, represented by the image of a sow's head. To this every morning they offer wine, water and milk. They light a lamp before it and burn a piece of juniper, the sacred shrub of Tibet. In the evening a piece of lighted juniper is carried through the house to drive out the evil spirits.

Doctrinally Tibetan Buddhism is a religion of contradictions. It is a mixture of atheism and pantheism, of monotheism and polytheism. Practically it is a mixture of heathen superstitions and Christian practices. In metaphysics and in worship it has borrowed much from Brahminism, and many things supposed to have been taken from Christianity were taken from the older Indian religions. Some Christian customs have been adopted from the Nestorian Christians established in China and Mongolia in the Middle Ages.³

This intercourse explains what would otherwise be unaccountable in a country so cut off from external influence, namely, the similarity of certain of their religious rites and practices with some

³ "Tibet and the Tibetans."

of those of the Catholic Church; but what can explain the still more extraordinary coincidence that many things in the government and organization of the religious orders in the Catholic Church are so similar to those of the Tibetan monks? To take a few examples: There are various different orders of Tibetan monks, some stricter, some less strict than others, just as there are in the Catholic Church.

As in the Benedictine Order the smaller houses or priories are under priors and subject to the larger monasteries, which are governed by Abbots, so among the Tibetan monks the smaller priories are subject to the mother house and governed by priors; the large monasteries are ruled by Abbots, often exceedingly powerful. As in the Dominican, Franciscan and many other orders of the Catholic Church, the local superiors are under a provincial, who in his turn is under the general of his order, so in Tibet the abbots of the various orders are under a provincial, the provincial under a general.

Tibetan monks serve a novitiate after being postulants for a time. Their term of probation is a long one; it lasts twelve years before they attain the highest grade. They can then fill various offices under the abbot, such as procurator, bursar, novice master, steward, librarian, apothecary, etc. They take lifelong vows of celibacy; they practise poverty and obedience and are bound to study. Hence they are the most cultured class in the country. Poverty appears to be a counsel of perfection not enforced by a vow, for each monk lives according to his means and his piety. Every monk has a cell of his own, very often among the richer lamasseries a house of his own, a monastery usually being a collection of buildings enclosed within walls. The monastery is only bound to supply each monk from the common funds with a certain quantity of barley and with a piece of cloth for clothing during the year, and with butter and tea three times a day. Tibetan butter, by the way, unlike European butter, is supposed to improve by keeping. It is used for burning in lamps instead of oil, and is put into tea instead of milk or cream. Buttered tea is as thick as chocolate and is the national beverage. The barley with which the monks are supplied is ground up and made into "psamba," which is mixed with tea by stirring the tea with the forefinger, twirling the cup or bowl round on the palm of the left hand.

A lama is not bound to leave all his property to his monastery. He only bequeathes a certain part of his private means to his lamassery; the rest goes back to his family.

M. Grénard estimates, and McRockhill agrees with him, that the population of Tibet is about 3,000,000, and out of this 500,000

are monks. All the flower of the nobility and gentry, all the finest and cleverest boys become monks. Every family, rich or poor, contributes one son to the religious orders, and every family of five sends two to be monks; in other words, every other son in each family becomes a monk, and it is the only chance the lower classes have of rising to a better position. The above estimate does not include the monks in Ladak and Sikkim, who are very numerous.

There are about 3,000 monasteries in Tibet; most of them on mountains and inaccessible places; some, as at Shasa and Tashilumpo, are in cities. Many of them are like fortresses and contain arms and ammunition, and in case of need the monks make their habits into trousers and arm and come out and fight or remain and defend their monasteries, as the case may be of offensive or defensive tactics.

The occupations of the lamas, who are monks rather than priests, vary very much. They may be, according to circumstances, parish priests or doctors, apothecaries or printers, sculptors or writers, wizards or fortune tellers, beggars or sellers of charms, horoscopes, incantations or indulgences in the shape of pills. They are sent for on all occasions by the people; at births, deaths, burials, sickness, betrothals, marriages, and are handsomely paid for all their services. They don't trouble themselves in the least about the spiritual welfare of the people. All they care about is to get as much out of them as they can and keep them under their authority in temporal matters as much as possible.⁴

Pure Buddhism is not a religion for the laity; it is only for the few. Hence the Buddhism of the Lamasseries is very different from that of the county, and the lamas have been forced, partly from greed of money and love of power, to indulge the people in many religious practices in which they themselves have no faith.

The whole country is ruled by the lamas, the Tale or Dalai Lama being the supreme ruler, higher than any of the Kings. Ecclesiastically he is the most important of all the generals, but still he is only "primus inter pares," but temporally he is supreme and his temporal power gives him a higher rank than the other generals. In this respect he differs from the Pope, to whom he is often compared. After the Tale Lama the Lama of Tachilumpo is the next highest personage in Tibet. He is very powerful, and the Chinese make use of his power and authority to keep the Tale Lama in check.

⁴ See "Tibet and the Tibetans."

⁵ "Journey to Lhasas and Central Thibet," by Surat Chandra Das. "Exploration of Thibet," by Mr. Sandberg.

⁶ See "The Exploration of Thibet," by Sandberg.

M. Grénard scarcely mentions Tibetan nuns, but we learn from Surat Chandra Das,⁵ who succeeded in visiting Lhasa (in which M. Grénard failed), that they are very numerous. Every respectable woman who is unmarried becomes a nun. Very frequently the girls leave home and enter a convent to avoid home duties, a practice perhaps not unheard of nearer home. Mr. Sandberg, who visited some convents, says: "The nuns seemed very happy. Their faces were smeared with gutta-percha, after the fashion of the country, and they varied in age from eleven to quite old women."⁶

There is one very celebrated lamessa, or abbess, who is one of the sights of Tibet. She rules the very important convent of Samding, and is supposed to be an incarnation of a divinity and to have taken form from a spirit called the Dorje-Pagmo. She was twenty-six when Chandra Das saw her, and wore her long black hair down her back. All other Tibetan nuns have their heads shaved. She is greatly venerated, and when she goes out is carried under a baldacchino; two mules precede her carrying incense pans, and perfumes are burnt before her by some monks all through her journey. Every year she is visited by pilgrims, who make her offerings.

Like the Poor Clares, she never lies down at night. She may, however, recline on a cushion or in a chair during the day; but at night she sits cross-legged on a cushion engaged in meditation. Her convent contains monks as well as nuns, from which grave scandals result. She rules supreme over all. She seems to be a sort of priestess, for she performs all sorts of magical rites and incantations, some of which are for the recovery of sick persons. She and all the Buddhist nuns take a vow of chastity, but when the Italian Capuchins visited Lhasa Father Belligatti was told a few years previously the Lamessa of Samding, in spite of her high spiritual birth, had scandalized the whole city by giving birth to a Lamessina. She still retained her position, and soon after announced she was about to engage in spiritual exercises which would occupy her three years, and which, let us hope, were of a penitential character.

The most important monastery after that at Lhasa, where the Tale Lama lives, is that of Tachilumpo, near the lay town of Shigatz. The abbot is next in power to the Tale Lama, and rules over the whole of the large province of Chang, in which he is supreme.

Another celebrated monastery and place of pilgrimage is at Skuburn. In a chapel here are some shrubs, the bark and leaves of which are supposed to be miraculously studded with Thibetan

characters, but the lamas confess that the letters are made by the monks with their finger nails, though they say the first tree did bear letters. This original tree grows on the spot where a great Buddhist reformer named Tsoungkapa was born, and his blood is supposed to have fertilized the soil and made the tree bear letters. It is considered an infallible remedy for barrenness, for barren women to visit this tree, to pray and lick the ground at its roots; and many come for this purpose. This monastery is in the extreme east of Tibet, not far from Sining. The temple in the centre of the monastery has a gold roof.

If the similarity between some Buddhist and some Christian customs, though partly accounted for, is strange, and if the similarity between their monastic institutions and ours is stranger, strangest of all is the similarity between certain doctrines in the two religions, of which we will give examples immediately.

A lama doctor whom M. Grénard met who had traveled in India, China, Turkestan, Mongolia and made several Tibetan pilgrimages gave it as his opinion that the three religions—Christianity, Buddhism and Mahomedanism—were at the bottom one and the same religion, with similar ethical teaching, and that Christ, Sakya-muni and Mahomet were all prophets inspired by the same Divinity called by the Christians God the Father, by the Buddhists Sankyé and by the Mahometans Allah. Of course no Christian can endorse the good doctor's opinion, but it is a very interesting one, for it shows in the first place that educated Buddhists believe in one Supreme Divine Spirit, in God; and in the next, that if only Buddhists and Christians knew more of each others' doctrines the Buddhist mind is by no means incapable of understanding and even of accepting Christianity.

To compare smaller things with great we often hear it said that the Ritualistic party in this little island is preparing the English nation for returning to the Catholic faith. Perhaps the Buddhism of Sakya-muni in its purest form, divested of idolations and heathenish practices, is preparing the Buddhist mind to accept Christianity. One thing is certain, neither Buddhists nor Mahometans nor any Eastern nation will ever be converted to Christianity by married missionaries nor by European women missionaries, who outrage all Eastern ideas of propriety and decorum by their costume and Western manners. Mrs. Bishop was most strong on this subject, and in her interesting book on China points out the harm done in that country by European women missionaries.⁷ Equally certain is it that Catholicity, with its grand ritual and ceremonies on the one hand, its mysticism and asceticism on the other, is the only form

⁷ "The Yangtze Valley and Beyond," by Mrs. Bishop.

of Christianity which will appeal to or satisfy the Eastern mind and soul.

To give an instance of the kind of similarity between some Christian and Buddhist doctrines, the Buddhist, as we have seen above, believes in a Divine Being who is One in essence, infinite, varied in attributes, from whom all things come and to whom all return. He also believes that this eternal, incorruptible Being or First Principle manifests Himself in Three Persons *without affecting the unity of His essence*. These three persons are not the same as the Three Persons in the Blessed Trinity, but surely it is a very wonderful fact that such a doctrine exists at all in a false religion. Still more strange is it that the third person of the Buddhist Trinity is supposed to proceed from the other two persons. The first person in their Trinity is the transcendental Buddha, the second is the celestial Buddha, the third is the terrestrial. The celestial Buddha proceeds from the transcendental, of which he is the reflection and representation; the terrestrial is Buddha made man.

Thus it appears that the doctrines of the Trinity and of the Incarnation are not new ideas to the educated Buddhists, but in a perverted form are held by them now, so that they would find less difficulty in accepting Christianity than Mahometans; for Buddhism in its purest forms is much nearer akin to Christianity than Mahometanism, since it is a much more spiritual religion.

Although railways and modern means of intercommunication have brought the East and West into closer communion with each other, we shall have to divest ourselves of the popular notion that all whom we call heathen are also ignorant before the hope of the evangelization of the East can be realized. We must also remember that though heathen, they are intensely religious, particularly the Tibetans, and though followers of a false religion, their enthusiasm constantly amounts to fanaticism in a way that often puts us Christians to shame.

As for their ignorance, M. Grénard tells us that in the seventh century Chinese, Indian and Tibetan philosophers had evolved the same system of philosophy which the German school of the eighteenth century thought they had first discovered; and modern travelers assure us that Buddhist lamas, Chinese and Hindoo philosophers are among the most cultured of men, the subtlety of the Eastern mind lending itself specially to the study of philosophy, while their skill as linguists is rarely equaled by Europeans.

Now that the British Government has got a foothold in Tibet, if Catholic missionaries could only steal a march on the Protestant missions sure sooner or later to be sent, there would be some chance of converting the Tibetans, whereas Protestantism is bound

to fail in this. Only the Catholic Church can ever satisfy the intellectual and spiritual desires of the souls of all sorts and conditions of men.

DARLEY DALE.

Scientific Chronicle.

SOME FACTS ABOUT ARSENIC.

The virulence of a poison is sometimes expressed by declaring it to be "as poisonous as arsenic." People who are in the habit of making this statement, as we can easily imagine, in sepulchral tones, will be somewhat astounded to hear that arsenic is contained in minute quantities in nearly all organs of the body, the proportion in some being relatively large, leading to the view that their efficient working depends on the presence of this element. M. Armand Gautier is responsible for this observation, and in a recent paper presented to the Académie des Sciences he gives some additional facts. The source of this arsenic is in the food we eat. Some of the figures in the paper referred to give the amounts of arsenic contained in various food stuffs. The figures give the weight of arsenic in thousandths of a milligramme contained in 100 grammes (0.22 pound) of fresh solids or in one liter (nearly a quart) of liquids: Beef (lean), 0.8; milk, 1.0; eggs, yolk, 0.5; white, 0.0; mackerel, 3.9; lobster (muscular part), 2.2; eggs, 35.7; shell, 104; water extract, 10.7; shrimp, 0.16; shell of same, 7.6; wheat, 0.7; potato, 1.12; wine, 0.89; beer, 6.01; salt, refined, 0.7; gray salt, 45; rock salt, 14. On the basis of these figures M. Gautier has calculated that the average amount of arsenic taken into the system per day is very close to 0.021 milligramme or about 0.0003 grain.

These results need not alarm us, as the arsenic, if it is present in the elemental state, is not poisonous. The white oxide, which is commonly called arsenic, is extremely poisonous, but only in doses of from two to three grains. It is used as a medicine, being especially useful in skin diseases. One can get used to taking comparatively large doses of the oxide by beginning with very small amounts and gradually increasing them, and indeed this is said to be done by peasants in certain mountain regions of the world, as in the Tyrol, for example. There is a reason for this. Arsenic strengthens the power of the respiratory organs and is thus a means of facilitating mountain climbing. We can easily conclude from these facts that if there ever was any danger from the arsenic in foods, and it is difficult, nay, impossible, to see how there can be danger from the small amount present, it has been obviated long since. Most of us must have reached the stage at which we can take our daily allotment with impunity.

There is another source, however, from which serious cases of arsenical poisoning have arisen. We refer to wall papers and fabrics colored with compounds of arsenic, notably with Scheele's green and Paris green. As early as 1869 it was determined with reasonable accuracy that such papers were responsible for poisoning, either from the absorption of arsenical dust or from the breathing of volatile compounds of arsenic formed from the paper. Subsequent investigation has confirmed this result, and there are on record many cases of poisoning from arsenic which was traced to the wall paper of the rooms occupied by the patients, the symptoms ceasing when the paper was removed. A bulletin of the United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Chemistry, recently published, gives a table of the amounts of arsenic contained in various samples of wall papers. The results are thus summarized:

1. The number of papers containing more than 0.1 grain per square yard is very small and has been much reduced since the passage of the Massachusetts law of 1900.
2. Most of the papers containing more than 0.1 grain per square yard are of foreign make.
3. There seems to be no reason why papers cannot be manufactured that contain no arsenic at all.
4. Since it is very doubtful whether 0.1 grain of arsenic per square yard is entirely harmless, it would appear that if any be present the amount should not exceed 0.05 grain per square yard.

Of fabrics it is said that "entirely too large a percentage of the dress goods, dress furs and fur rugs sold on the American market contain excessive amounts of arsenic."

NITROGEN FOR FERTILIZERS.

In a recent number of the *QUARTERLY* an account was given of some experiments made in Germany with nitrogen-fixing bacteria. It was hoped that the commercial introduction of these bacteria would prove to be a solution of the nitrogen problem in agriculture. However successful as the investigators had been in the laboratory, their product was not a success in the field, and so the manufacture of the prepared organisms was given up. It seemed a pity that such a promising method of increasing the world's supply of available nitrogen should be abandoned, and so the matter was taken up by the United States Department of Agriculture and investigations were made in its laboratories under the direction of Dr. George T. Moore, of the Bureau of Plant Industry.

In the course of the investigation it was found that bacteria bred in Media of the usual kind containing much nitrogen were of practically no use in fixing atmospheric nitrogen and making it available as nitrates for plant nourishment; so a nearly nitrogen-full culture medium was secured and used with gratifying success. It was discovered that the power of the organisms to fix nitrogen could be thereby increased five or ten times. And so a large number of cultures were made and about ten thousand of them sent to various parts of the country, together with specific directions as to method of application. The culture is dry, of about the size and form of an yeast cake. The drying process does not affect the bacteria, which can be revived after being in this state for a year or more. To revive them they are immersed in water to which the proper amount of nutrient salts is added. Here they multiply rapidly, the water frequently turning milky white from the number formed in twenty-four hours.

This water containing the organisms may now be applied either to the seed or to a cartload of earth, which is then spread over the field to be inoculated. Have the results been gratifying? Very much so. Of the ten thousand cultures sent out nearly three thousand have been reported upon, and almost all favorably. In some places one part of a field was inoculated, while the other was left as usual with ordinary fertilizing. The contrast was remarkable. The plants in the inoculated portion of the field were so dense that no ground was visible between them; those in the remaining part were sparse and small. The yield was in proportion, being increased 400 or 500 per cent. and sometimes more. Plants were sent to the department from both parts of the field, one being four or five times the size of the other, though grown from the same seed and, barring the inoculation in one case, under the same conditions of soil and climate.

COPPER SULPHATE AS A WATER PURIFIER.

No one will question the importance of keeping the water supply of a community free from contamination from any and every source. It is of little use to spend millions in order to enlarge the capacity of our reservoirs if the water to be stored in these same reservoirs is not reasonably pure and odorless. Strange to say, the importance of this fact has impressed itself upon the country at large only within the last ten years. At the outset it was evident that in order to know what preventive measures to adopt the sanitary engineer

must know the nature of the pollution. So the chemist was called in to analyze the water. The results were, however, not satisfactory, for although the amounts of organic and mineral matter in the water, as well as the percentage of albumenoid ammonia, were accurately determined, it was found that waters were often drunk with impunity, although they contained large quantities of these substances. The foulness of the smell arising from some waters was what disgusted people more than anything else. Yet some foul-smelling waters are comparatively harmless in their effects, while many clear sparkling waters contain baneful bacteria in abundance. Of late years the microscope has been brought to the aid of the chemist, and as a result it has been agreed that a bacteriological examination is just as important as a chemical one. The turbidity, bad tastes and odors of waters are due to the growth of some minute plant or animal, the algae and certain bacteria and some minute animal organisms; but the algae are the most responsible.

These algae are a group of plants numbering about one-fifth of the known cryptogams or flowerless plants; their usual habitat is water or very damp places. Botanists locate the ancestors of the entire vegetable kingdom among them. They sometimes reach the length of 700 or 800 feet, and certain grass-green forms frequently form a green "scum" on the surface of stagnant pools called "frog spawn" or "pond scum." Some cause trouble in a mechanical way, while some undoubtedly help to purify water. Those popularly known as "blue-green algae," or schizophyceae, which, by the way, may have various shades of olive, yellow and brown, chocolate or purplish red, are the great offenders in the matter of water pollution. Some means have been sought to remove this source of contamination. Since most algae must have light in order to develop, the covering of reservoirs has sometimes been resorted to, but the expense is far too great for this measure to have any extensive application. A good preventive measure is to keep organic matter from getting into the reservoir. Aeration is not of much use, as algae often multiply more rapidly when oxygen is plentifully supplied. A new and seemingly universally applicable method is the use of copper sulphate in dilutions so great as to be colorless, tasteless and harmless to man. It is cheap, the cost of treating water for the extermination of algae being not over sixty cents per million gallons. It can be used also for destroying pathogenic bacteria, but only in more concentrated solutions, and may be removed afterwards by precipitation. It can be so applied as to leave beneficial bacteria unharmed. Finally it promises to be of use in exterminating mosquito larvæ. The United States Department of

Agriculture is still experimenting, and we may hope for great benefit therefrom for the water supply of the entire country.

THE ELECTRIFICATION OF TWO GREAT RAILROADS.

On November 12 last an electric locomotive hauled a full-sized passenger train over a specially prepared track near Schenectady, New York, at a speed of sixty-nine miles an hour. During the trial it outsped the fast "New York" express, which was running on a parallel track at nearly sixty miles an hour. The trial was made for the New York Central Railroad, and it may fairly be looked upon as marking an epoch in railroading, for after the trial an order was placed with the General Electric Company for fifty or sixty similar locomotives. The third rail system was used, the rail being protected by a wooden hood, which makes it impossible for any one to make contact with the rail unless he wishes to; although, as a matter of precaution, an overhead transmission has been adopted at crossings and stations.

The managers of the New York Central have been considering for a long time the feasibility of electrifying at least portions of their immense train system. There was a general demand for a change in the vicinity of New York city especially. People have not been slow to appreciate the comfort arising from electrically propelled trains, especially the absence of dust and smoke, the rapidity of starting and stopping and the ease with which large trains could be run at frequent intervals for suburban traffic. The company, therefore, has let out contracts for the electrification of its entire system within the "New York zone," south of Croton on the main line and south of White Plains on the Harlem division. The New York, New Haven and Hartford will be similarly equipped south of Woodlawn. Electric locomotives will do the work for the through and express trains, while each car intended for suburban work only will be equipped with its own motor.

The Northeastern Railroad of Great Britain has completed the electrification of its lines within the district of Tyneside. The authorities of the road were driven to do this by the competition of the street railways in the district. The third rail is used here also, and electric locomotives will be used for freight haulage, the passenger coaches having motors for themselves. The steam locomotive has now a dangerous competitor which surpasses it in cheapness and convenience of service.

THE SIMPLON TUNNEL.

Our readers are doubtless aware of the immense tunnel that is being bored through the Alps from the Rhone Valley to Northern Italy. The total length when completed will be $12\frac{1}{4}$ miles, of which distance only 260 yards remain unfinished. The engineers in charge have had many great difficulties to overcome. First of all the temperature at the depth of the tunnel beneath the surface, 7,005 feet, or nearly $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles, fifty per cent. deeper than man has ever been before, ranges from 100 to 115 degrees Fahrenheit, and an elaborate system of air cooling had to be resorted to. Then springs have been encountered which have seriously interfered with the progress of the work. One in 1901 discharged nearly 8,000 gallons of water per minute. Recently another burst upon the workmen with serious loss of life. It was of boiling water and flowed at the rate of 18,000 gallons per minute. This accident was thought by some engineers to be fatal to the enterprise, but the pluck and persistency that has come to the assistance of the clever engineers in the past will surely not desert them now. At least let us hope that this great undertaking will not prove past accomplishment.

GENERAL NOTES.

THE HYDROSCOPE.—One of the writer's early recollections is that of the description of an apparatus by which the bottoms of rivers, ponds and even the sea bottom could be viewed from the surface. It was very simply constructed, consisting merely of a hollow tin vessel shaped like a truncated pyramid somewhat elongated, blackened on the inside and having a piece of glass cemented in for a base. The claim was made that if this was placed in water with the bottom upwards, the privacy of the finny denizens of the deep would be intruded upon and many wonders laid bare if one would but take the trouble to look. No attempt was made by the writer to prove this statement, who is glad to note that an invention designed for the same purpose has been used successfully in Italy. Cavaliere Giuseppe Pino is the inventor, and the instrument is called the hydroscope. It consists of a steel tube provided with a complex system of lenses numbering twelve. The lenses, of course, are in the submerged end of the instrument, and the images formed by them are reflected upwards by means of mirrors to a sort of camera obscura house on the top above the surface of the

water. One of the instruments can be fitted into the bottom of a war vessel and so arranged that it can be withdrawn and made flush with the bottom. The inventor has been able to read a newspaper at a depth of 360 feet from the surface by means of the ordinary daylight which has penetrated to that depth, so that light will not be wanting. Searchlights could be used, too, and placed beside the lenses.

A PLAN FOR INVESTIGATION OF THE EARTH'S CRUST.—At a recent meeting of the British Association the Hon. C. A. Parsons suggested that our knowledge of the earth's crust might be materially extended by borings made in the crust to a depth of twelve miles, the operations to extend over a number of years if necessary. Another scientist objected that at this depth the pressure of the overlying rock would aggregate forty tons per square inch. At this pressure rock would become viscous, and by flowing inward would put a stop to further boring. Mr. Parsons suggests that an experiment be made to determine if such would be the case. A column of granite or quartz rock should be taken and fitted into a steel mold. Steel flows at a pressure lying between 120 and 300 tons. If now a small hole were to be bored through the centre and a pressure of 100 tons per square inch be applied, the rock would be under the pressure that would be exerted upon it at a depth of thirty-eight miles. Any shrinkage in it could be easily observed. does now.

AN OLD RIVER CHANNEL.—Geologists have known for a long time, but few laymen have ever suspected, that there is a submarine grand canyon of the Hudson river. The slope of the ocean bottom off the continent at New York is only about one foot in 968 for a distance of over 120 miles. At this point the waters suddenly deepen, and this marks the edge of the continental shelf. Soundings have revealed a marked depression in this shelf. A gorge has receded inward for nearly thirty miles, with a depth of at least 4,800 feet. This merges into a valley which extends back for 71 miles with a depth of from 6,000 or 7,000 to 9,000 feet. More recent soundings have shown more of the real form of this valley and gorge, which must mark the old course of the Hudson when the continent stood ten thousand feet higher above the sea than it

A NOVEL FIRE PROTECTION.—Recently in London a simple but very effective contrivance for the protection of buildings from fire was exhibited with marked success. It consists of a horizontal pipe carried completely around the building near the roof line. This

pipe is perforated on the under side, the holes being very close together, and is connected to a vertical standpipe, in which the water is under a pressure of eighty pounds to the square inch. When the valves are opened the stream of water forms a curtain completely around the building. A similar pipe on the roof, arranged so as to throw a sheet of water entirely across, completes the apparatus, which is said to have so impressed the insurance companies that they granted a material reduction in the premium.

PEARY'S NEW DASH FOR THE POLE.—Peary is to start next summer on another dash for the Pole. He is confident of success this time. The steamer he is constructing in Maine will be a marvel of strength and will have besides an ice-breaker in the bow, a bottom so constructed that she will rise if ice were to close in upon her. The famous commander will start by way of the shores of Grant land, and when he reaches a point far enough north will continue the journey on sledges, taking Esquimaux as his companions and living as they live. He will construct numerous caches and so establish his base of supplies as to have them as close to the Pole as possible. Peary knows thoroughly what he is undertaking. Let us hope he will succeed.

DR. HEDIN'S EXPLORATIONS.—The results of Dr. Sven Hedin's three years' explorations in Central Asia are being rapidly made ready for complete publication. As a result of his work a region before practically unknown has been thrown open to the knowledge of the world in a way that one would not have thought possible for one man. Besides his explorations proper, Dr. Hedin made meteorological and astronomical observations of great value, besides gathering large collections of geological, zoological, botanical and archæological interest. These observations and collections are being discussed and described by experts. Four volumes of commentary will appear with an atlas of probably 120 maps.

M. J. AHERN, S. J.

Book Reviews.

AUBREY DE VERE. A memoir based on his unpublished diaries and correspondence. By *Wilfrid Ward*. With two photogravure portraits and other illustrations. 8vo., pp. x.+428. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

This excellent memoir of so good a man is a great gain to English literature. That long life which began on January 10, 1814, and ended on January 21, 1902, is well worth the telling. And it is also worthy of the pen of Mr. Ward, who so far excels in biographical writing, and who is doing so much to give to the world a permanent true record of the illustrious and good men of the nineteenth century in England. And the world is much richer in the possession of such lives. It has many volumes that tell of the statesmen, and soldiers, and actors, who have moved across the stage, but their entrances and exits have not always been for edification. Too rare are lives like that of Aubrey de Vere, pure as the limpid stream which brings music to the ear and charm to the eye. He lived in the presence of God always; in constant communion with Him, seeing Him in all His works, and looking forward with a blessed hope to the moment when he should leave this world and meet Him face to face. How little the world and the worldling know of the charm of such a life! What infinite gain to the world if it can catch even a small taste of its beauty! If the world could only be induced to accept such a man for a hero and a model, how much better it would be! Many look on such a man as weak. But it is a mistake to suppose that refinement and delicacy of mind indicate lack of virility. On the contrary, such men are strongest because their higher nature is more fully developed, and they are strong intellectually and spiritually. Hence Aubrey de Vere won all who came in contact with him whose hearts were pure enough to bear the contact.

As another reviewer has said of him: "The refinement and delicacy of his mind never impaired its virility—nor the habitual solemnity of his thoughts, his gaiety and sense of humor—so that, as Coventry Patmore said, he 'looked like sunshine' to the friends he visited. Above all it was his sense of religion—as sweet and kindly as it was sincere and deep—pervading his whole life, that, reflected in his every action, imparted to them the incomparable charm of utter unworldliness.

"It is not wonderful that with such a man friends were not so much numerous as innumerable. His life was, in fact, made up of friendships as deep and tender as they were high-souled."

Among them we find the best and most prominent men and women of his time. For instance: Wordsworth, Southey, Campbell, Hartley, Sara Coleridge, Rogers, Sydney Smith, Mrs. Craven, Cardinal Newman, Father Faber and a host of others. Besides these he came in contact with nearly all, if not all, persons of prominence on many occasions, and he frequently refers to them and their movements in his letters and diary. And here it may not be amiss to let Mr. Ward tell us something of his own work. He says:

"When as Mr. de Vere's literary executor under his will I examined his papers with a view to publishing some of his prose remains I found that practically nothing was written of the second volume of *Recollections* which he had planned. The letters and diaries, however, which he was revising with a view to their possible posthumous publication at once struck me as in many cases suitable for this purpose, for they deal with matters of general interest and include some graphic contemporary descriptions of great men. Contemporary letters convey a sense of actuality which *Recollections* do not always carry.

"But while such features of interest were probably what led Mr. de Vere himself to contemplate the publication of his letters, the present writer was yet more impressed by the picture they conveyed of their author himself—of a personality which for spiritual beauty, both of mind and of character, and for the completeness in it of poetic temperment must, I think, be allowed to be one of very rare interest.

"His personality was one which made a deep impression on those who were intimate with him. 'I have lived among poets a great deal, and have known greater poets than he is, but a more entire poet, one more a poet in his whole mind and temperament, I never knew or met with.' Thus wrote Sara Coleridge, the daughter of Samuel Taylor Coleridge, the intimate friend of Wordsworth and of the Southey's. Cardinal Newman once expressed to a friend an estimate of Aubrey de Vere very similar to Sara Coleridge's, and added that the power of self-expression displayed in his poetry (of parts of which the Cardinal was a great admirer) was not fully adequate to representing the beauty of the poet's mind.

"The present work is, then, in the first place an attempt at the exhibition of a very remarkable mind and character, as displayed in his intercourse and his correspondence with his friends. I have in my incidental selections from Aubrey de Vere's poetry had the same object in view; and while poems acknowledged to be among his happiest are included among them, my principal aim has been to choose those which best help to depict the poet himself.

"It will be to some readers an attraction, to others the reverse, that, as in the case of his beloved Dante, the poetry and philosophy of Christianity were the most absorbing subject of de Vere's imaginative meditation. The spirit breathed in the pictures of Giotto and Fra Angelico breathes in the letters and poems of Aubrey de Vere. And to minimize this element would be to fail in depicting the central object of his life and thought. Yet, as in the case of his great hero and friend Cardinal Newman, the play of human nature was very graceful and varied in him, and I have endeavored in my selection of material to do justice to both sides of his temperament."

We shall make a few quotations from letters and diaries to give the reader some idea of the treat in store for him. How very striking, for instance, is this short description of de Vere's first impression of Newman at Oxford in December, 1838:

"Early in the evening a singularly graceful figure in cap and gown glided into the room. The slight form and gracious address might have belonged either to a youthful ascetic of the Middle Ages or to a graceful, high-bred lady of our own days. He was pale and thin almost to emaciation, swift of pace, but when not walking, intensely still, with a voice sweet and pathetic, and so distinct that you could count each vowel and consonant in every word. When touching on subjects which interested him much he used gestures rapid and decisive, though not vehement. . . . As we parted I asked him why the cathedral bells rang so loudly at so late an hour. 'Only some young men keeping themselves warm,' he answered."

Of Oxford he says: "Oxford delighted me far beyond my expectations. If I may judge by the kindness with which I was treated, it quite as well deserves to be called a city of courtesy as of learning. Newman is the most monkish-looking man I ever saw—very dignified, very ascetical and so very humble and gentle in manner that it would almost have the air with which the Jesuits are reproached, if it were not accompanied by an equally remarkable simplicity."

Of the Oxford chapels and Newman at service he says: "I will not attempt a description of these marvelous chapels of Oxford. You must only imagine the most exquisite combination of stone cut into lacework, and enormous windows, every single pane of which is blushing 'with blood of Queens and Kings.' I attended evening service at Christ Church and morning at St. Mary's, the parish church which Newman belongs to. It is about as large as an Irish cathedral, and as rich as all of them put together. Newman's reading is a beautiful sort of melodious, plaintive and rather

quick half-chant. The prayers he says kneeling at the steps toward the altar, only turning to the people when he blesses them, as in the versicle, 'The Lord be with you, and with thy spirit.' He looks like a very young man made old by intense study—his forehead is very high, but not very broad."

In Lent, 1839, he visited Rome, and in a letter written to his sister in April he says:

"Rome is to me far the most interesting place I have ever been at. I am more surprised every day that it is not ten times as full of strangers as it is, for I should have thought that strangers from all parts of the world would have been continually flocking to Rome as a centre of universal interest. There is no refined taste which you cannot gratify here."

Then follow descriptions of churches, colleges, galleries and persons which are most appreciative. The following comment on the famous "Miserere," in the Pope's chapel, and the benediction from the balcony of St. Peter's is worth quoting:

"I must not forget to tell you that I was delighted even beyond my expectations with the 'Miserere' in the Pope's chapel. I heard it three times; it is, I think, the most exquisite music I ever heard. It is melancholy beyond all that I could have thought it possible to produce in sweet sounds, but at the same time so unearthly that you might fancy it the wailing of angels after their fall. The ceremonies of the Holy Week did not give me so much pleasure as I had expected with the exception of the benediction from the balcony of St. Peter's. The whole population of Rome and many from the neighborhood were collected within the embrace of the circular colonnades and in the court below; and it was a grand thing to see the immense multitude bowing down, like a cornfield yielding to the breeze, as the Pope extended his arms in the shape of a cross and pronounced his benediction 'Urbi et Orbi.'"

In the early forties, when the Oxford movement was approaching a crisis, we find Mr. de Vere back in London and in touch with those most intimately connected with that movement. From his diary of this time we cull the following:

"May 11—Went to Margaret Street Chapel. Dr. Pusey, who officiated, was like a saint in tribulation, or one over whom some great calamity was impending.

"May 12—Dined with Mr. Richards. Mr. Newman's conversion was openly spoken of. I saw a great deal of zeal, earnestness and Roman enthusiasm among the party, but nothing of largeness of mind and fearless love of Truth. My impression was that such men could not appreciate Catholicity as distinguished from Romanism, and that they felt no loyalty to the Church of England.

"May 14—Called on Dr. Pusey. He looked ill and seemed as if he had neither eaten nor slept for two days. He spoke cheerfully of the Church, but rather on Providential than on philosophical grounds, and rather pressed my taking orders. He approached the subject of Newman three or four times and glanced away again. At last he spoke of his change as certain; said it had been going on for these seven years and would be avowed this year; said it would be a great crisis, and by far the greatest blow the cause had received."

This is very interesting in the light of after events. The reader should remember that at this time Aubrey de Vere was not himself a Catholic. His approach to the Church was very gradual. His father intended him for the ministry, and although he never embraced that state, he was always a God-fearing, honest searcher after truth, and the following extract from a letter to his sister in 1851 indicates that at that time he was very close to it:

"There are some things here of such interest that I would not readily miss what perhaps may not soon be procurable again. The other morning, for instance, breakfasting with W. Monsell, I met three of the most distinguished theologians of three nations, whose conversation, as you may imagine, was such as is seldom heard. They were Manning, De Ravignan and Dr. Döllinger. The mode in which the three countries were represented by these three minds was extraordinary—the depth of the German, the scientific precision of the Frenchman and the grave vigor of the Englishman. Among other things they discussed the religious prospects of Europe. Döllinger took a sanguine view of them, De Ravignan rather a gloomy one, but all three agreed that the world would eventually be polarized into two great sections, the Roman and the infidel, and that all the intermediate theories were used up and worn out. How far this may be true I know not, but certainly I am every day more struck by the great difference which I observe between the Protestants and Roman Catholics with whom I converse. The former seem so vague in their faith and so shifting in their arguments; the latter always seem to me to hold all the great truths of the three creeds as in eagle talons. Whatever may be the character of their peculiar tenets, the great common dogmas of the faith seem to me secure with them only. This circumstance I own increases my reverence for Rome daily."

On November 15 of the same year, in the Archbishop's chapel at Avignon, whither he had gone with Dr. Manning, Aubrey de Vere was received into the Catholic Church. On the same day he wrote to Mrs. Coleridge:

"After my letter to you from Paris, it will be no surprise to you

to learn that I was this morning received into what I believe to be that one Catholic and Apostolic Church confessed in the Creed and commissioned from on high by God Himself. For some time my convictions had been far clearer than those which we require for action in matters of secular concern, nay, had been as clear as I believe to be possible previous to action on matters which admit of no absolute and scientific demonstration because they belong to the supernatural region of faith. Such convictions involve duties, and that which we believe we are bound to confess. Such convictions, if they be true, come to us also by grace and through God's Providence; and His gifts, if not used, will be withdrawn. In this belief I have acted. May He accept the act as one of obedience to Him, and may He bestow on me those spiritual gifts of which obedience is the gate, especially humility, contrition and love."

Such faith and obedience bring their reward with them. Hence we are not surprised to hear the convert say:

"Do not imagine for a moment that a convert to Roman Catholicism loses any portion of sympathy with his old friends. I find exactly the contrary to be the case. Rome itself is half thrown away upon me from the degree in which my thoughts revert to those whom I most value, and my affection for whom seems to make newer friends of little interest. . . .

"From what Catholicism has taught me of Christianity, and from what confession (that most misapprehended of all things) has taught me of my own heart, and especially of the power of pride in its latent forms, I do not think that I could have continued a Christian had I not become a Roman Catholic, though I dare say I should have given the name of Christianity to whatever new heresy or new version of an old one I preferred to the 'Faith once for all delivered.'

"You will be glad to know how far Rome satisfies me. I can hardly tell you how entirely it does so. . . . I should probably have been a Catholic years ago if I had not been in some sort a poet, and had a poetical predilection for the vague in thought and the vagabond in life. Such dispositions are not quickly shaken off, and even after my reception I was more annoyed (as a matter of taste) by seeing these Southerners spitting in church than I was gratified by the marble of the temples and the incense cloud. But in all substantial things I have had a grave and solid satisfaction from the first, moral, intellectual and spiritual, and that satisfaction has been progressively deepening the more I have seen, thought and felt.

"The Roman Catholic Church is so very much more than I had

expected to find it, and that, while a Protestant, I ever imagined that a church could be. It is so distinct from, and so raised above, the very highest of its precious possessions. Abounding, for instance, in books, it is so wholly distinct from a 'literature' that millions might pass their lives (even among the intelligent) with hardly a remembrance that it has more than a few devotional books, the Bible and the decrees of the Councils.

"It is equally independent of science. If all the schoolmen and the fathers vanished in a moment, a Catholic feels that the sacred processes of the Church, her inner and outer life, would go on just as before, even as Nature would carry on her glorious works of mercy and power, though all the books of natural philosophy should be burned.

"It is so equally with art. The poorest village or mountain church in which there is an altar and the Blessed Sacrament makes a Catholic feel a diviner presence than I as a Protestant ever felt in cathedrals—that diviner presence which bears the same relation to Christianity and the Incarnate Word that the sentiment expressed by Gray's celebrated lines, '*Presentiorem perspicimus Deum*,' etc., bears to Natural Religion."

Aubrey de Vere's life after he entered the Catholic Church continued to be as calm and peaceful as the above quotation leads one to think it would be.

We shall close our review of this most delightful book with a description of the poet in extreme old age, from the pen of Mr. Edmund Gosse:

"Aubrey de Vere's appearance at the age of eighty-three is very vivid in my recollection. He entered the room swiftly and gracefully, the form of his body thrown a little forward, as is frequently the case with tall and active old men. His countenance bore a singular resemblance to the portraits of Wordsworth, although the type was softer and less vigorous. His forehead, which sloped a little and was very high and domed, was much observed in the open air from a trick he had of tilting his tall hat back. . . . There was something extraordinarily delicate and elevated in his address. He was, in fact, conversation made visible. I never knew a more persistent speaker. If he broke bread with one, the progress of the meal would be interrupted and delayed from the very first by his talk, which was softly, gently unbroken, like a fountain falling on moss. On one occasion we sat together in a garden in the summer. Mr. de Vere talked with no other interruption than brief pauses for reflection for three hours, in itself a prodigious feat for an old man of eighty-four, and without the smallest sign of fatigue.

"The principal, perhaps the only sign of extreme old age which the poet presented until lately was the weakness of his voice. This must have been, I think, very melodious, but already when I knew him first it had become so faint as to be sometimes scarcely audible, particularly in company. It was, therefore, very pleasant to be alone with him, especially in the open air, when he seemed to speak with particular freedom and ease. The astonishing fullness of his memory made his conversation marvelous and delightful. He not merely passed with complete comprehension of the relative distance from events of 1820 to events of to-day, but his verbal memory was astounding. He garnished his recollections of Wordsworth, Rogers, Landor or Sir Henry Taylor with copious and repeated quotation from their poetry. Indeed, he once assured me that of certain favorite poets—in particular Wordsworth, Shelley and Keats—he still retained at the age of eighty-four 'substantially the bulk of their writings.' He said that his principal occupation had been and still was, in his solitary walks, or by the fire, to repeat silently or aloud page after page of poetry. His memory of the great writers was, he believed, so exact that in these exercises he had the illusion that he was reading from the printed book."

WHOSOEVER SHALL OFFEND. By *F. Marion Crawford*. With eight illustrations drawn in Rome, with the author's suggestions, by Horace T. Carpenter. 12mo., pp. 388. New York: Macmillan Company.

The full title of Mr. Crawford's latest story is contained in the following words of Christ: "Whosoever shall offend one of these little ones which believe in Me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea."

The scene is laid in Italy, principally at Rome. An unprincipled Italian adventurer who is a fugitive from justice in South America, where he has committed murder, succeeds in concealing his identity and in marrying a wealthy Roman widow with one child—a son in his sixteenth year. The adventurer conducts himself so well that his wife makes a new will three years after their marriage, leaving him a life interest in part of her estate and the reversion of the whole in case anything should happen to her son. Then the adventurer poisons his wife without exciting suspicion and tries to murder the boy. In this, however, he fails, and the victim with a fractured skull wanders away and is taken in by an obscure country innkeeper and his wife, who rob him and plot for his death that they may not be disturbed in the possession of their plunder. He is saved by a peasant girl who works at the inn and who falls in love with the sick boy. Of this peasant girl we are told that she

is handsome, clever and fearless, but that "her moral inheritance was not all that might be desired; for her father had left her mother in a fit of pardonable jealousy, after nearly killing her and quite killing his rival, and her mother had not redeemed her character after his abrupt departure. On the contrary, if an accident had not carried her off suddenly, Regina's virtuous parent would probably have sold the girl into slavery."

After Regina has succeeded in getting the young man Marcello to a hospital, where his memory is restored by a surgical operation, his stepfather, Folco Corbario, fits up an establishment for him and Regina quite convenient to the family palace, and then they begin their sinful career so openly that every one knows of it. From this time it is the purpose of Folco to induce the young man to kill himself by dissipation in order that he may get possession of the inheritance. To this end he gives him advice like this:

"The only thing you had better avoid for a few years is marriage!" Falco laughed softly as he delivered this bit of advice and lit a cigar. Then he looked critically at Marcello.

"You are still very pale," he observed thoughtfully. "You have not got back all your strength yet. Drink plenty of champagne at luncheon and dinner. There is nothing like it when a man is run down. And don't sit up all night smoking cigarettes more than three times a week!"

It is not quite clear why Falco did not murder Marcello as he had attempted to do near the beginning of the story, but that would end the tale too soon, at least for commercial purposes. The nature of the alliance between Marcello and Regina is flaunted in the face of the reader at every turn, and there is never a hint of its abomination. On the contrary, the impression might easily be created, especially on young minds, that it was excusable and in more ways than one commendable. If we quote on this point, we do so with apologies to our readers and for the purpose of justifying the conclusion which we intend to draw.

The peasant girl never had the slightest hope of marriage; in fact, she did not desire it. Hear her:

"You wish to please me? Love me! That is what I want. Love me as much as you can, it will always be less than I love you; and as long as you can, it will always be less than I shall love you, for that will be always. And when you are tired of me tell me so, heart of my heart, and I will go away, for that is better than to hang like a chain on a young man's neck. I will go away and God will forgive me, for to love you is all I know."

When her lover wishes to hang jewels about her neck she refuses them with these words:

"Keep those things for your wife!" she said with flashing eyes and standing back from him. "I will wear the clothes you buy for me because you like me to be pretty, and I don't want you to be ashamed of me. But I will not take jewels, for jewels are money, just as gold is! You can buy a wife with that stuff, not a woman who loves!"

It was while this sinful alliance was in full vigor that the heroine gave this exhibition of her respect for sacred things:

"Do you take me for a Turk?" Regina asked, laughing. "I go to confession at Christmas and Easter. I tell the priest that I am very bad and am sorry, but that it is for you and that I cannot help it. Then he asks me if I will promise to leave you and be good. And I say no, that I will not promise that. And he tells me to go away and come back when I am ready to promise, and that he will give me absolution then. It is always the same. He shakes his head and frowns when he sees me coming, and I smile. We know each other quite well now. I have told him that when you are tired of me, then I will be good. Is not that enough? What can I do? I should like to be good, of course, but I like still better to be with you. So it is."

"You are better than the priest knows," said Marcello thoughtfully, "and I am worse."

On another occasion she says to her lover:

"Are we not happy here? Is it not cool in the summer and sunny in the winter? Have we not all we want? When you marry, your wife will live in the splendid villa on the Janiculum, and when you are tired of her, you will come and see Regina here. I hope you will always be tired of her. Then I shall be happy."

But the inevitable end must come. Falco is discovered and he kills the tool who has been acting as servant and spy in the house of Marcello and Regina. He is sentenced to thirty-seven years' imprisonment, although he has killed many persons.

Regina contracts a fever and dies, while Marcello marries a respectable and beautiful young lady whom he has really loved from childhood.

Regina, almost at the last moment, is asked if she wishes to see a priest, and she says: "Yes, there is time for that." We had hoped that she would die repentant, but these are her last recorded words, spoken to the respectable lady who is later to marry Marcello:

"If you have ever stood between us," she said, "you had the right. He loved you first. There is nothing to forgive in that. Afterwards he loved me a little. No one can take that from me; no one! It is mine, and it is all that I have, and though I am

going, and though I know that he is tired of me, it is still more than the world. To have it as I have it, I would do again what I did from the first."

And then the author pictures Marcello and the respectable lady whom he is going to marry visiting the tomb of the public unrepentant sinner to plant flowers on it and pray at it.

The book is bad. It will do great harm because it comes from the pen of Mr. Crawford and has an air of respectability about it. But it teaches the reader that tolerant familiarity with impurity which ought to be despised and abhorred. Nothing could be more degrading than the picture of the woman who is about to pass into eternity boasting of her sinful life and declaring that she would live it over again in the same way if she had the opportunity, and then handing over the partner of her guilt to the virtuous young lady who moves in the most fashionable society, who accepts him without the slightest hesitation, and assures the dying wretch that she does not blame her for the life she has led. That is the crown of Mr. Crawford's latest work.

SOCIALISM: Its Theoretical Basis and Practical Application. By *Victor Cathrein, S. J.* Authorized translation of the eighth German edition, with special reference to the condition of Socialism in the United States. Revised and enlarged by Victor F. Gettelmann, S. J. 12mo., pp. 424. New York: Benziger Brothers.

There can be no question as to the timeliness of the appearance of this book. The evil which it strives to combat is world-wide, ruinous and spreading. Until comparatively recent years we were free from it in this country; but the large immigration of the heterogeneous masses from Europe, with their grievances, real and imaginary, and their revolutionary, socialistic, anarchistic and atheistic tendencies, begotten by the peculiar conditions in which they were born and lived, has brought the evil to our very doors and into our houses. The effect is seen even in the youngest, smallest and least important servant. Speaking of the growth of the evil, the author says:

"Within the last few years socialism has spread to an alarming extent. At the last general election in Germany, June 16, 1903, it polled considerably above three million votes. The jubilant exultation of socialists at this unparalleled success may easily be imagined. 'Berlin, the capital of socialism! Germany, the realm of social democracy!' Thus the Vorwarts triumphantly exclaimed.

"In view of this gigantic development of social democracy it certainly behooves every man of culture, but above all the leaders in civil and social life, to become familiar with socialist ideas, to

make themselves acquainted with the scientific basis so much vaunted by socialists, and to form an independent judgment concerning them."

For a time it was thought that the evil could be best met by force, and indeed even at the present time many who are in power are trying to stay it in that way. The writer does not agree with them. He says:

"To oppose the spread of socialism by means of police regulations, as was done by the famous Socialist Law of Germany, must always prove utterly abortive; in this struggle intellectual and moral weapons rather will be used to advantage."

Some writers think that social reform is all that is required, and many professed socialists claim that this is all they desire. It is true that social reform along reasonable lines will remove the grievances which now furnish ample material for the declamation of social agitators. "But social reform is not the real aim of socialists. Their purpose is the radical subversion of all existing social conditions and the reconstruction of society on an entirely new basis. That this their attempt is impracticable and fraught with disaster is to be seen in these pages. This theoretical exposition of socialism has become more important nowadays than ever before; nay, it is absolutely necessary.

"From these remarks it is clear that our object is purely critical and negative. We do not make any proposals of practical reforms, not because we are opposed to them or deem them superfluous, but because they are beyond the scope of this work.

"In our refutation of socialists it has been our constant endeavor to enter into their ideas to the best of our power, to study their principles in their own writings, to inquire into the foundations upon which their system is based, to examine their principal demands and the relations they bear to each other.

Since its first appearance in 1890 Father Cathrein's book has gone through eight large editions. It has been translated into Spanish, French, English, Italian, Polish, Flemish, Bohemian and Hungarian. Competent critics have declared the present volume to be the best refutation of socialism to be found in the German language. The generous praise bestowed from such different quarters gives proof that Father Cathrein's accuracy and thoroughness may be relied upon and renders any commendation on our part superfluous. However, a few words of explanation as to the making of the present edition may not be out of place. In view of the quickened activity and growing influence of socialists in the United States it became highly desirable to have an English version of this book in accordance with the latest German edition. Besides comprising all the

matter contained in the eighth German edition, the present volume offers a reliable account of socialism in the United States compiled from authentic socialist sources. Also in other respects the book has been adapted throughout in American conditions. It has thus been increased to more than twice the size of the former American editions, and may rightly be styled a new work. A copious alphabetical index will no doubt enhance the practical value of the work. Here is the author's conclusion, drawn from sound premises:

"We trust the unprejudiced reader who has patiently followed us throughout our exposition has gained the conviction that socialism, even in its most rational and scientific form, is visionary and impracticable. It is based on untenable religious, philosophical and economic principles, and, far from leading to the glorious results held out by its advocates to the unlearned masses, would prove disastrous to that culture which Christianity has produced, and would reduce human society to a state of utter barbarism."

The book is fittingly closed with the great encyclicals of Leo XIII. on "The Condition of Labor" and on "Christian Democracy."

THE MIDDLE AGES. Sketches and Fragments. By *Thomas J. Shahan, S. T. D., J. U. L.*, Professor of Church History in the Catholic University, Washington, D. C.; author of "The Beginnings of Christianity," etc. 8vo., pp. 432. New York: Benziger Brothers.

When we expressed the hope in our review of Dr. Shahan's charming essays on "The Beginnings of Christianity" that the learned author would be able to continue their publication, we hardly expected that our hope would be realized so soon. But here is the second volume, bringing the studies into the Middle Ages, and we are sure that it will be as warmly welcomed as was its predecessor. The prompt appearance of the second volume encourages us to think that the first was appreciated. We do not mean by scholars only, who know so well the value of a work of this kind, but by the general serious minded reading public, irrespective of creed, who want to know the truth in history. Indeed, Dr. Shahan's essays should appeal to even a wider circle of readers, for they are as interesting as the best novels.

The period covered by the new volume is fully as attractive for the writer and student as the earlier period, and although the writer must necessarily limit himself in so wide a field, yet the selections are so well made as to create definite impressions in regard to the period as a whole. The author states his purpose in the following words:

"The historical sketches and fragments that are here submitted

to the general reader deal only with a few phases of the rich and varied life of the period known as the Middle Ages. The writer will be amply rewarded if they serve to arouse a wider interest in that thousand years of Christian history that opens with Clovis and closes with the discovery of the New World. Both in Church and State the life of to-day is rooted in those ten marvelous centuries of transition, during which the Catholic Church was mother and nurse to the infant nations of the West, a prop and consolation to the Christians of the Orient. Our modern institutions and habits of thought, our ideals and the great lines of our history are not intelligible apart from a sufficient understanding of what men thought, hoped, attempted, suffered and founded in the days when there was but one Christian faith from Otranto to Drontheim. The problems that now agitate us and seem to threaten our inherited social order were problems for the mediæval man. The conflicts and difficulties that make up the sum of political history for the last four centuries are only the last chapters of a story of surpassing interest that opens with the formal establishment of Christian thought as the basis and norm of social existence and development."

The titles of the essays are: "Gregory the Great and the Barbarian World," "Justinian the Great," "The Religion of Islam," "Catholicism in the Middle Ages," "The Christians of St. Thomas," "The Mediæval Teacher," "The Book of a Mediæval Mother," "German Schools in the Sixteenth Century," "Baths and Bathing in the Middle Ages," "Clergy and People in Mediæval England," "The Cathedral Builders of Mediæval Europe," "The Results of the Crusades on the Italian Renaissance."

They have appeared elsewhere at intervals, principally in *THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW*, the *Catholic University Bulletin*, the *Catholic World*, the *Ave Maria* and the *Catholic Times*.

We trust that the very reverend author will be able to follow this volume with a third in the near future, and we are glad to be one of the original channels through which such valuable information reaches the public.

JOSEPH KARDINAL HERGENROETHER'S HANDBUCH DER ALLEGEMEINEN KIRCHENGESCHICHTE. Vierte Auflage, neu bearbeitet von Dr. J. P. Kirsch. Zweiter Band: Die Kirche als Leiterin der abendlaendischen Gesellschaft. Herder, Freiburg and St. Louis. Price, \$5.00 net.

With remarkable promptness the second volume of Professor Kirsch's revision of Cardinal Hergenroether's Manual of Church History follows upon the first, already commended in this REVIEW about a year ago. A year's use of the former volume has caused

us to modify our objection to the freedom which the editor allowed himself to take with the text. We believe that the changes are all of a nature to improve the great work in every respect, and that Hergenroether would be the first to ratify them. Not only has Dr. Kirsch brought the work up to date by availing himself of the results of historical investigations during the past twenty years, but also his distribution of the vast material is more scientific and gives the reader a clearer survey of the progress of events. We are still of opinion that it would have been a decided improvement if the history could have been issued in a half dozen easily handled volumes instead of three bulky ones, the first of 722 and the second of 1,104 pages. This, however, was impossible so long as the History remained a portion of the great "Theologische Bibliothek."

The volume before us conducts the history of the Church from the days of the first political union with the new nations of the East in the times of the early Carolingians to the eve of the Protestant Reformation, that is, the whole period of the Middle Ages and Renaissance. To condense a stretch of eight centuries into a compass of a single volume is no easy task; in fact, it is much more difficult to write satisfactorily a succinct narrative than an extended one. That Cardinal Hergenroether's Manual was by far the most perfect history of its kind that had yet been produced was the unanimous verdict of Catholic scholars; and this favorable opinion is now confirmed by no less an authority than the Supreme Pontiff, who in a letter addressed to the publisher of an Italian version of Kirsch's first volume and placed at the head of the second volume, bestows unstinted praise as well upon the eminent writer as upon his present editor, and recommends the book warmly to the Italian clergy. Would that so valuable a work were made equally accessible to English-speaking peoples! We have absolutely nothing like it in our language.

SYNOPSIS THEOLOGIAE MORALIS ET PASTORALIS, ad Mentem S. Thomae et S. Alphonsi, Hodiernibus Moribus accommodata. Tomus Tertius: De Virtute Instititiae et De Varis Statuum obligationibus. Auctore ad. Tanquerey, S. S. 8vo., pp. xx.+547+31*. Neo Aboraci: Benziger Fratres.

We reviewed the first volume of Father Tanquerey's work on "Moral Theology" with pleasure some time ago. It was so excellent in every respect as to create in us a desire to see the work completed. The examination of the third volume increases this desire, and we are glad to note that the second volume is promised within a year.

We might sum up our criticism of this book by saying that the author lives up to his title, and although this might seem small

praise at first sight, on further consideration it will be found to be high commendation.

We have here a synopsis of moral and pastoral theology in three moderate sized volumes. It is not hard to make a synopsis of any subject or work which will touch every part, but it is very hard to make one that will give to each part the amount of attention which it requires so as to preserve that nice balance which brings about comprehensiveness with clearness and conciseness. Father Tanquerey has that happy faculty. To acquire it one must know his subject well, and he must be well acquainted with his clients. He must also take into consideration the changes that come with the advancement of time, and the variations of conditions in different countries and amid new environments. Then he must have the courage to recognize these variations and changes and fit his subject to them. Father Tanquerey has done this in his "Moral Theology." As he is writing it for America, he takes account of all the conditions peculiar to this country and regulates his subject matter accordingly. This does not require that any violence shall be done to the moral law. On the contrary, it supposes a surer groundwork so that the adjustment to special conditions may be more safely made.

An illustration of this adjustment is found in the present volume in the section on Socialism, which is so closely connected with the question of justice at the present time as to demand very special attention. The author recognizes this and treats the question accordingly. This is only one illustration of the practical value of the book. Throughout the whole work Father Tanquerey shows his knowledge of the practical needs of the moral theologian on the mission in this country and his ability to supply them.

A special feature of the present volume is a concise summary of the civil law of Great Britain and the United States, on copyright, patents, real and personal property, parent and child, guardian and ward, husband and wife, corporations, prescription, contracts, last will and testament and the law of descent.

We feel sure that it will be universally conceded that this book is a very valuable addition to the excellent manuals of moral theology which have already appeared in this country, and that it occupies a distinctive place.

SUMMA THEOLOGIAE MORALIS SCHOLARUM USUI ACCOMMODAVIT. H. Noldin, S. J., S. Theologiae Professor in Universitate Oenipontana. 3 volumena, 8vo. Neo Eboraci: Fr. Pustet.

This is the fourth edition of Father Noldin's work on Moral Theology, and no book on the subject in recent years has won higher

encomiums on the other side. Even a cursory glance at the work convinces one that these encomiums are well merited. The author follows the usual order and covers the whole field, and in this he is not remarkable, but in the discernment which he shows in giving due prominence to the most important feature of each question, while arranging subsidiary matter in such a manner as to show its lesser degree of importance, he shows the master who is most helpful to the student. We have said that he follows the usual order in arrangement, but he has made two exceptions to this rule. After the treatise "De principiis" in the first volume he adds distinct fasciendae "De Sexto Praecepto et De Usu Matrimonii" and "De Poenis Ecclesiasticis."

We have never read a clearer author. We may say without reservation that Father Noldin knows his subject, which is not surprising in a teacher of moral theology; but we may add that he is able to make others know it, and this is surprising indeed. The most learned men are often the most obscure. This is not more evident in any field than in the field of moral theology. How often have we not all gone to some standard author to seek light and found only darkness. No one who consults Noldin can make this complaint. We have never met a clearer author. His one great desire is to communicate thought, and he chooses the simplest language to do it. Any student of Latin can follow him. If Latin authors would follow his example in this respect there would be no demand for text-books of theology in the vernacular.

This book is sure to win favor in the United States as it has won it in Europe, although it makes no pretense of being adapted to this country. We should not be surprised, however, to see a later edition with such adaptation.

THE PULPIT ORATOR. Containing seven elaborate skeleton sermons, or homiletic, dogmatical, liturgical, symbolical and moral sketches, for every Sunday of the year. Also elaborate skeleton sermons for the chief festivals and other occasions. By *Rev. John Evangelist Bollner*. Translated from the German with permission of the author, and adapted by the Rev. Augustine Wirth, O. S. B., with preface by the Rev. A. A. Lambing. Tenth revised edition. Six Vols. Large 8vo., about 450 pp. each. New York: Pustet & Co.

The tenth edition of so pretentious a book as "The Pulpit Orator" is its best recommendation. Nothing but merit could create a demand for so many editions of a sermon book in six volumes at the present time, when the market is flooded with sermon books of all shapes and sizes. The first edition of this book was a thousand copies. We do not know the size of succeeding editions, but we have in mind other similar works in several volumes

that have appeared and disappeared in recent years without any demand for even a second edition.

We seldom commend sermon books; on the contrary, we generally condemn them for several reasons. The work before us is an exception. In it the author never preaches himself, never runs after novelties, never strains for effect, but he develops in a straightforward, simple manner the epistle and gospel of the day. Hence the work is somewhat in the nature of a commentary, and that is the very best sermon book.

Here the preacher is furnished with abundance as well as variety. For each Sunday he has homiletic, dogmatical, liturgical, symbolical and moral sketches. It is a well-known fact that preachers have moods as well as hearers, and hence the wisdom of such a storehouse. But we feel that "The Pulpit Orator" does not need further commendation. Its merits are too well known to all except perhaps the very recently ordained, to whom it will prove a welcome friend.

CATHOLIC IDEALS IN SOCIAL LIFE. By *Father Cuthbert, O. S. F. C.* 12mo., pp. 249. New York: Benziger Brothers.

This is an unusually strong collection of essays on vital questions connected with the social life. The reverend author is a clear, strong thinker, who puts his thoughts into plain, vigorous language, so that they have a convincing force not always found in works of this kind. Some of the essays have been used originally as addresses, and some of them have been published before singly, but they appear together now for the first time. The author says of them:

"Several of the papers in this volume—"St. Francis and You," "The Workingman's Apostolate," "The Priest and Social Reform" and "The Idea of Responsibility"—have already appeared as pamphlets or as articles in magazines. I have to thank the editors of the *Catholic World*, the *Tablet* and the *Weekly Register* for their kind permission to reprint these articles.

"Throughout these papers the reader will perceive a unity of thought and purpose. My desire has been to give expression to the Catholic mind touching some of the most urgent questions of the hour in regard to social life and conduct. I have written not for the student or specialist, but for the ordinary intelligent wayfarer whom these questions concern."

As speakers and writers frequently want short treatises on such subjects, and as these are so excellent, we think it well to add the entire table of contents:

Part I.—"The Church and Personal Liberty," "The Christian

State," "The Education of Women," "Marriage," "The Value of Work," "The Priest and Social Reform," "The Responsibility of Wealth," "The Idea of Responsibility."

Part II.—"Religious Aspects of Social Work," "The Workingman's Apostolate:" 1. "The Catholic Workingman a Missioner," 2. "Conditions Essential to Workingman's Apostolate," 3. "Duties of the Catholic Workingman at the Present Time." "St. Francis and You:" 1. "The Franciscan Vocation," 3. "The Three Radical Evils in Society at the Present Day," 3. "The Need of Personal Service."

LIFE OF ST. ELIZABETH OF HUNGARY, DUCHESS OF THURINGIA. By the *Count de Montalembert*, Peer of France, Member of the French Academy. Translated by Francis Deming Hoyt. 8vo., pp. 491. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

Montalembert's "Life of St. Elizabeth of Hungary" has been a classic so long that it seems superfluous to praise—for one cannot speak of it without praising it—and yet it may not be known to the present generation as well as it deserves. It is possible, too, that it has been somewhat overshadowed by the distinguished author's larger and more frequently quoted work, "The Monks of the West." For many readers the following words quoted from the preface may be a surprise:

"Of his literary works the best known and most valuable is undoubtedly 'The Monks of the West.' But it is to the inspiration from which he drew his work upon 'The Life of St. Elizabeth' that we owe the later and larger work. The first was the sweet and fragrant flower that yielded in due time its rich and abundant fruit.

"And here we recall that in opening and closing the beautiful 'Life of St. Elizabeth' Montalembert quotes the words of our Blessed Lord: 'Jesus answered and said: I confess to Thee of Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent and hast revealed them to little ones.'"

Those who have not made the acquaintance of this splendid example cannot do so under more favorable conditions than in this edition, while old friends will rejoice to see their favorite so becomingly clad.

THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS, 1493-1898. Explorations by Early Navigators, Descriptions of the Islands and Their Peoples, Their History and Records of Catholic Missions, as related in contemporaneous books and manuscripts, showing the Political, Economic, Commercial and Religious Conditions of those Islands from their earliest relations with European Nations to the close of the Nineteenth Century. Translated from the originals. Cleveland: The Arthur H. Clark Co.

An important announcement is made by the Arthur H. Clark

Company in connection with their monumental and exhaustive work on the history of the Philippine Islands, which is in course of publication. It is worthy of note that the publishers are showing that they feel the importance of the work which they have undertaken by improving wherever possible. The latest announcement follows:

"A chronological list of all the Spanish Governors of the Philippine Islands, from 1565 to 1899, furnishing in condensed form valuable information regarding each—the date and place of his birth, dignities held, arrival in the islands, term of office, important events therein, date of death, etc.—will appear in Volume XVII. of 'The Philippine Islands: 1493-1898' (A. H. Clark Company, Cleveland). No such list has yet appeared in any other publication, although in some Spanish works there are biographical notices of the successive Governors up to the middle of the nineteenth century. The list above referred to will be of the utmost value alike to students and to general readers of Philippine history. It may be added that all students of modern European history will be greatly aided by similar chronological tables found in Volume I. of the same series—lists of the Roman Pontiffs, the rulers of Spain and the rulers of Portugal, from 1493 to 1803. These lists also cannot be found in any other work, and all have been carefully prepared from many sources—sifting, collating and verifying data which are scattered and sometimes conflicting."

SEQUENTIA CHRISTIANA, OR ELEMENTS OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION. By *Charles B. Dawson, S. J., B. A.*, Exeter College, Oxford. 12mo., pp. xvi.+316. London: R. & T. Washbourne. New York: Benziger Brothers.

"The object of this little work is to give a simple and concise account of the chief doctrines of the Catholic religion in their natural and logical sequence. It is intended for the use of those who, like the author, have the happiness of being brought, by the special mercy of God, from the misery and danger of doubt to the fullness and Divine certainty of faith. It may also serve as a beacon-light to souls—and there are many—who are struggling up steep and difficult paths to the rock of safety and strength—the Ancient City of Refuge—the Catholic Church. Those also who are engaged in the charitable work of instructing converts and others into justice may find it a book on which to base their teaching. The writer does not attempt to prove what is stated by long arguments; he relies chiefly upon the more reasonable force of the bare statement of truth itself and upon the authority before which most of those for whom he is writing bow—the Holy Scriptures."

This is an exceptionally good book of its kind. It is comprehensive, the catechism furnishing the ground plan. The order is faithfully followed, and hence the logical sequence is preserved; the language is simple, clear and dignified; the quotations are apt and satisfying and the references full. The marginal index is an excellent feature of the book, and on the whole we should say that there is nothing better published in this field.

There is an air of repose about the book, if the term may be used in this connection, that is seldom found. The author has evidently worked slowly and carefully, and the result is a book unexcelled and well worthy of the attention of those interested.

A DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE. Dealing with its language, literature and contents, including Biblical theology. Edited by *James Hastings, M. A., D. D.* Vol. V., royal 8vo. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

The appearance of this volume may surprise those who have not followed closely the work as it came from the press. It was announced in the beginning that the work was to be in four volumes, and the editors and publishers did not break faith with the public, for the dictionary proper was completed within the prescribed limits. The additional volume is really supplementary and should be procured by those who subscribed for the original work.

During the progress of the dictionary through the press it was seen that here and there its articles touched somewhat closely upon subjects that lay outside the precise scope of a dictionary of the Bible, but articles on these subjects are not only interesting in themselves, but are most helpful to the study of the Bible, and indeed necessary if that study is to be thorough and abreast of modern scholarship. It was therefore decided that an extra volume should be prepared to include such articles as well as a series of indexes which had been no part of the original plan, but of which many readers of the dictionary had urged the utility.

The volume will not be sold separate, but will be supplied only to subscribers for the original work. It is, we consider, fully as valuable as any of the other volumes.

MORAL BRIEFS. A concise, reasoned and popular exposition of Catholic morals. By *Rev. John H. Stapleton.* 12mo., pp. 311. New York: Benziger Brothers.

"The contents of this volume appeared originally in the *Catholic Transcript*, of Hartford, Conn., in weekly instalments, from Feb-

ruary, 1901, to February, 1903. During the course of their publication it became evident that the form of instruction adopted was appreciated by a large number of readers in varied conditions of life—this appreciation being evinced, among other ways, by a frequent and widespread demand for back numbers of the published journal. The management, finding itself unable to meet this demand, suggested the bringing out of the entire series in book form; and thus, with very few corrections, we offer the 'Briefs' to all desirous of a better acquaintance with Catholic morals."

So much for the history of the book. As for the substance, it is made up of a series of short instructions on the capital sins, the Divine virtues and the commandments of God. They are written in popular form, without quotations from the Sacred Scriptures or the Fathers, and hence have not that solid value which is demanded in subjects of this kind. But perhaps this was foreign to the author's purpose, who was writing primarily for the reader of a newspaper, who is not generally inclined to devote serious thought to his occupation, and therefore requires special treatment.

IN MANY LANDS. By a Member of the Order of Mercy. Author of "Leaves From the Annals of the Sisters of Mercy," "Life of Catherine McAuley," etc. 12mo., pp. xx+460. New York: O'Shea & Co.

The author, who is well known through the other books which she has written, tells of a visit which she and her companions made to Europe. The narrative is bright, interesting and instructive. There is nothing new in books of this kind except the new point of view, but very much depends on that. If one cannot visit foreign lands and see them through his own eyes, the next best thing is to see them through the eyes of some one who can reproduce the pictures in words. Now as in painting one will admire the picture of one artist and another prefer a picture of the same subject by a different, so in books. Competent judges who heard this book read in manuscript urged its publication in order that a larger number might enjoy the pleasure which had been limited to a few.

DIE PARABELN DES HERRN IM EVANGELIU exegetisch und praktisch erlaeutert: Von *Leopold Fonck, S. J.* Second edition, enlarged and improved. Innsbruck: Pustet. 900 pages.

Upon the foundation of a thoroughly scientific exegesis, the learned Professor Fonck, S. J., of the University of Innsbruck, has built up a work of surpassing spiritual beauty. That the book filled a much-felt need was shown by the rapidity with which the

first edition disappeared from the market. In fact, it is difficult to explain why so fascinating a subject as Our Lord's Parables should have been for long so comparatively neglected in Catholic circles, even in Germany. This is the more remarkable, since the Protestant and Rationalistic world have been abundantly supplied with literature on the subject. Father Fonck came to his task excellently equipped. A lengthy sojourn in the Holy Land made him familiar with the physical background upon which, as he beautifully phrases it, "the Lord traced in magnificent coloring His wonderful imagery." No detail of Palestinian life and conditions escaped his watchful eye, and he was thus enabled to bring forth out of a well replenished treasury new things and old. The use of the book for the purpose of preaching is greatly facilitated by the copious indexes at the end, especially by the reference to the gospels of the year. As usual, we close with the regret that we have nothing so perfect in our language.

JESUS CHRIST THE WORD INCARNATE. Considerations gathered from the Works of the Angelic Doctor, St. Thomas Aquinas. By *Roger Freddi, S. J.* Translated from the Italian by F. J. Sullivan, S. J. St. Louis: Herder. Price, net, \$1.25.

That no one since the days of the inspired Apostles has written of the divine personality of Our Lord with the power and dignity of the incomparable Doctor Angelicus is the definite judgment of the Catholic Church, a judgment ratified by the Word Incarnate in the immortal words: "*Bene scripsisti de me, Thoma.*" It was a gracious thought, therefore, of Father Freddi, after himself thoroughly digesting the Summa and other writings of the saint, to give the substance of them, as far as they related to Our Lord, in a simple form adapted to every intelligence. The author has carefully avoided admitting a single idea which he did not find in his master; so that we may say that he speaks to us precisely as St. Thomas would do were he addressing a modern miscellaneous audience on the subject so near his heart. We commend the book with all earnestness, not only to seminarians and preachers, but also to religious communities and, in fact, to all educated Catholics.

VERA SAPIENTIA, OR TRUE WISDOM. Translated from the Latin of *Thomas à Kempis* by the Right Rev. Mgr. Byrne, D. D., V. G. (Adelaide, South Australia). 12mo., pp. x.+204. New York: Benziger Brothers.

We quote from the preface by the author:

"The works of Thomas à Kempis need no praise, for they have stood the test of time, which commits to oblivion many works that

had been once praised and wide read. I have never seen an English translation of the work of Thomas à Kempis entitled 'Vera Sapientia' ('True Wisdom'). A Latin copy of this work published in Paris in 1804 came into my hands. Having read it with pleasure and profit, I did it into English. Friends to whom I showed it advised me to publish it, in the belief and hope that it would do good."

We are quite sure that all readers of this little book will be glad that the translator yielded to the persuasion of the friends who advised its publication. It is filled with the unction and sweetness with which we are familiar in the eternal Imitation. It is divided into books as that work is, treating of "That virtue has to carry on war with vice," "What things can be truly and justly called bad," "The miseries which the good endure in this world" and "On the virtues of a truly Christian man."

ROSA MYSTICA: The Fifteen Mysteries of the Most Holy Rosary and Other Joys, Sorrows and Glories of Mary. By *Kenneth Digby Best*, of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri. St. Louis: Herder. Price, net, \$6.00.

This magnificent volume is a tribute to Mary Immaculate on occasion of the jubilee of her Immaculate Conception. No expense has been spared to make it in every way worthy of its object. The copious illustrations, selected from the works of all the great Catholic artists, are beyond all praise, and the accompanying text of Father Best is replete with sound doctrine, pervaded with a spirit of filial devotion to the Queen of the Holy Rosary entirely worthy of a child of St. Philip. We are sorry that the book arrived in our hands too late for the glorious jubilee itself; but it has enduring worth, and must find its way into universal favor.

THE GOSPEL APPLIED TO OUR TIMES. A sermon for every Sunday in the year. By *Rev. D. S. Phelan*. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder, 1904. Price, \$2.00 net.

Father Phelan has so original and trenchant a mode of expressing his thoughts that we fancy we should have detected the authorship of these fine sermons, even had they been issued anonymously. Each one has all the snap and verve of an editorial in the *Western Watchman*, tempered, however, by that keen sense of responsibility which every good priest feels who is delivering, not his private views, but a divine message. Long known as the most fearless and efficient of our Catholic editors, Father Phelan may now add to his titles that of "powerfullest preacher." There is a directness,

a conciseness and a freshness about these sermons that will secure them an enduring place in the esteem of the American clergy. We have no doubt the veteran editor has many other arrows in his quiver. We trust he will shoot them at us.

PROGRESS IN PRAYER. Translated from the Instructions Spirituelles of *R. P. Causade, S. J.*, by *L. V. Sheehan*. Adapted and edited, with an introduction, by *Joseph McSorley, C. S. P.* St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder, 1904. Price, 75 cents.

The editor's introduction to this excellent manual of instruction in spiritual science contains a brief account of the errors of Quietism and Bossuet's unfortunate controversy with Fenelon. By the practical form of question and answer many points are very clearly stated in a way especially adapted to the needs of beginners. In the attempt to tread the mystical way of perfection there should be guidance by one who has "the sure eye and steady foot of the Alpine climber." For the encouragement and direction of souls aspiring to close union with God this volume of 178 pages will be found one of the best now available in the English language.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

PRAYER BOOK FOR RELIGIOUS. A complete manual of prayers and devotions for the use of the members of all religious communities. A practical guide to the particular examen and to the methods of meditation. By *Rev. F. X. Lasance*. 12mo., pp. 1,153. New York: Benziger Brothers.

THE IMITATION OF THE SACRED HEART OF JESUS. By *Rev. F. Arndt, S. J.* Translated from the Latin by *I. M. Fastre*. 16mo., pp. 734. New York: Benziger Brothers.

THE MIRROR OF TRUE MANHOOD AS REFLECTED IN THE LIFE OF ST. JOSEPH. From the French. By *Rev. John F. Mullany, LL. D.* 16mo., pp. 325. New York: Fr. Pustet & Co.

COR CORDIUM. THOUGHTS FOR THE CLIENTS OF THE SACRED HEART. Written and compiled by *Madame Cecelia*, Religious of St. Andrew's Convent, Streatham. 24mo., pp. 133. London: R. & T. Washbourne. New York: Benziger Brothers.

THE ROSARY: SCENES AND THOUGHTS. By *Rev. F. P. Garesche, S. J.* 32mo., pp. 177. New York: Benziger Brothers.

THE NEW CENTURY CATHOLIC SERIES OF READERS. Third and fourth. Illustrated with black and white pictures, and with chromo-lithographs. New York: Benziger Brothers.

OFFICIUM HEBDOMADAE MAIORIS, a Dominica in Palmis usque ad Sabbatum in albis, iuxta Ordinem Brevionii, Missalis et Pontificalis Romani editum. 12mo., pp. 420. Neo Eboraci: Fr. Pustet.

A LIFE OF SHAKESPEARE. By *William J. Rolfe, Litt. D.* One volume, cloth, 8vo., illustrated, \$3.00. Same, one-half morocco, \$5.00. Boston: Dana Estes & Co.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the *QUARTERLY* will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the *REVIEW* not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXX.—APRIL, 1905—No. 118.

THE EDUCATIONAL FACT.

IT IS nearly twenty-three centuries since the master mind of antiquity attempted to establish the principles and to sketch a plan of the training that, from the viewpoint of the highest pagan wisdom, was adapted to the formation of an ideal citizen. Since Plato's day much rhetoric and writing material have been expended on the question of education. Writers of various degrees of intelligence and scholastic experience have occupied themselves in defining its nature, purpose and methods, while in these opening years of the twentieth century what is called—euphemistically perhaps—the literature of education has become so voluminous that no thoughtful man would venture to read a tithe of it. And apparently the subject is not exhausted. Year by year books on education are issuing from the press in geometrical progression. Journals and magazines devoted exclusively to the discussion of educational topics are published quarterly, monthly, fortnightly—and some of them hebdomadally—to the number of about one hundred in this country alone. Our National Bureau of Education, created by an act of Congress in the year 1867 to collect statistics regarding the condition and progress of education in the United States, and to diffuse information respecting the management of schools and methods of teaching, has in pursuance of the end of its creation added since 1868 many bulky volumes and numerous circulars of information to our engorgement of pedagogical erudi-

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1905, by P. J. Ryan, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

tion. Nor is this all. Teachers meet annually for the purpose of exchanging ideas on matters connected with their profession, or of listening to the wisdom of those who have attained eminence in seats of learning; and thereafter the printed report of what was said, and done, and resolved demands a resting place on our library shelves. Assuredly for the last century or so multitudinous streams from many sources, and of various characters have been disem-boguing into the ocean of educational literature. But in our own days education is being industriously and multifariously discussed and defined, subjected to experiment, discussed again, and redefined as never before. The science of pedagogy now counts its votaries by the thousands. And the smiling schoolboy, whom Plato in his old age declared with a torrent of Greek superlatives to be the most insidious, sharp-witted, insubordinate and unmanageable of all animals, has become a problem as entrancing and suggestive as the trusts and their parents, the protective tariff and the railroad rebate.

The question naturally arises: What has been the outcome of all this intellectual activity? Have our school systems from year to year by their uniform growth in practical efficiency, in certainty and uncapricious constancy of disciplines, and in fulness and wisdom of scope exhibited the sagacity and rational worth of the voluminous literature published in recent years "to promote the cause of education throughout the country?" Has the idea underlying the word, "education," been more precisely defined, and the purpose of the processes indicated by the word been more accurately fixed? Are the fruits of education in our country to-day any evidence of the value of the thought that has been expended on it?

I.

To give an answer that cannot be reasonably controverted to this question, we ought to determine what education is, and what effects it should aim at producing in those that are subjected to its influences. The word itself is freely used, being one of the shibboleths of the age, and like many words of the kind it fluctuates in meaning. Education has, as I have just said, been defined in many ways by recent pedagogical writers. Some of these definitions are colored by the writer's philosophic or sociological views, and consequently manifest his predilections, and implicitly convey his bias. As a rule in seeking his definition he has been wanting in purity of intention. He has obviously, perhaps unwittingly, framed it with an eye to the conclusions he wished to inculcate, or the practical changes he desired to effect. Consequently he often excludes from the concept of education much that the word historically implies,

and includes, unduly emphasizes or exaggerates much that is peculiar to his personal beliefs regarding man's destiny, his purpose in life and the nature of his social and civic relations. Assuming that education is a generic term, comprehending various kinds and not a word signifying a number of disparate and unrelated processes, I doubt if any definition can be proposed less unwarranted and more neutral than the traditional one, which simply asserts that education is the unfolding and development of man's faculties, the educing from the potentiality of the individual—to use the phraseology of the schools—of that physical, intellectual and moral maturity and perfection in act of which the individual is capable. Every disciplinary process, therefore, by which this maturity and perfection are in any degree attained is in the widest sense of the term educational. This definition preëmits no theoretical position, and begs no vexed question.

In a stricter sense education may, without prejudice to any theory, be defined to be a full and harmonious development of those faculties that are distinctive of man, namely, of his intellectual and moral faculties. The primary purpose of all education, properly so called, is to develop and train mental powers and to form and to fix character. To develop intellectual ability without a homologous development of character is to create social Franksteins; and to form character while neglecting the faculties of the mind is to deprive of tools one best fitted for using them well. Mental powers and moral character are both undoubtedly needed in order that man may fully and harmoniously realize self; but undoubtedly also the most important for personal well-being and for the stability of society are the moral powers. The capacity to use intellectual gifts most effectively without an inward sense of moral responsibility to control and direct their use makes man like some great ocean ship possessing powerful propellers, but wanting a sane pilot. On the other hand, the disposition ingrained by training to guide conduct by moral ideas, even when unaccompanied by wide knowledge and ripened intellectual efficiency, is a source of individual strength and of social value. So long as man is by nature destined for life in the society of his fellow-men, a faculty capable of perceiving clearly and fully the essential relations between himself and other men, and a will trained to adjust habitually his conduct to his perceptions is of the highest necessity for his own safety and happiness, and for the social order of the community in which he lives. This will be evident if we recall briefly the aim of civil society.

In every well ordered civil community there is a tendency making for progress and a tendency making for civilization. Progress is an external and instrumental element in the well-being of a civil

community; civilization is its intrinsic complement, the goal of its perfection. Progress comprises wealth, the agencies that most effectually produce wealth, what wealth can procure, material comfort, the conveniences of life and the material aids to refinement. Civilization denotes intellectual and moral qualities that make community of life agreeable, salutary, finished and ennobling. Progress calls for the exercise of the commercial and industrial virtues; civilization demands something more. The *respublica* or common weal is not limited to the Midas-like faculty of turning everything into gold. There are some things that cannot be turned into gold, and some things that gold cannot produce, without which, nevertheless, life in the society of our fellow-men would, in accord with evolutionary standards, become a mere struggle for existence in which the physically strongest, the shrewdest and the most unprincipled would survive. Civilization imports first in the individual man that he is a *civis* not only of this or that nation, but also of the ideal commonwealth, called humanity, and that he acquire the virtues that make him *civilis*, and secondly in the organized political body a consciousness of common interests and purposes, of solidarity and of a humanizing destiny. A people may for a time be progressive in a high degree, and may possess a spurious refinement, deceptive by its appearance, without being highly civilized; and a people may be advanced in civilization, though lacking in progress. The measure of a people's civilization is their practice—not merely their profession—of the virtues which liberalize ideals and conduct; the measure of their progress is the skill and industry with which they use their intellectual powers to control and adapt to human needs the forces of nature. Progress of an advanced kind may be conditioned by the possession of coal and iron, or other material bounties of nature; civilization will depend proximately on the reign of justice and ultimately on mutual benevolence and an unselfish sense of solidarity.

Justice and benevolence may be counterfeited by umbral substitutes. Justice may be a legal right written in the fundamental law of the people, and every one may by law be entitled to exact it—if he can; or it may so inform their life, so fashion their modes of thought, so mould their habits of action that it will be mutually and spontaneously granted. Justice is not legality. Legality measures the extent of a citizen's obligations by the enactments of legislatures or the decisions of courts, and upbraids him only when and because by his deeds he has risked the possibility of incurring legal retribution. Justice is ampler than the law of the land; it reaches the inner recesses of thought as well as the outward action of which the law takes cognizance, together with many others that evade the

meshes of the law. It is, moreover, motivated by a principle that is universal in its application, and independently of penalties is sacrosanct in its decrees. It is only when personal traits of a superior kind, wisdom and charity, breadth of view and sympathy, self-respect and reverence for the manhood of others prevail that this virtue becomes—what legislation can never make it—the vital custom, the instinctive habit and the daily manners of a people, and that civilization assumes a character of maturity.

Again, mutual benevolence and the sense of human fellowship may be supplanted by philanthropy, which sinks all personal sympathy and the warmth of neighborly love in devotion to a cold, abstract and scientific virtue which we have recently called altruism. Altruism and charity are as opposed in principle as are the nadir and zenith, although the manifestation of one bears a resemblance to that of the other. One is the transfigured selfishness of utilitarianism, the other is the joyous forgetfulness of self in the love of another. That they differ, St. Paul intimates in his first epistle to the Corinthians. "If I should distribute all my goods to the poor," he says, "and if I should deliver my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing." One may, therefore, in St. Paul's judgment, bestow one's fortune on others and be ready to sacrifice life itself for them, and yet not have the virtue of charity. Charity implies more than the conferring of alms on others. Its specific character and distinction are not determined by the exterior act, but by the interior motive of acting and the inward attitude of mind and heart towards the person who is its object. The altruist out of some partial principles creates an idol, "a cold spectral monster" Hawthorne calls it, which is only a reflection of himself, "projected upon the surrounding darkness." Out of regard for this idol he distributes his donations, unstirred by any emotion towards the recipient. The man who has charity forgets self and is motivated only by a feeling of personal love for a fellow-being. Altruism, therefore, is seated in the head, charity in the heart. The difference between altruism and benevolence may be illustrated by the contrast between the repentance of Judas and St. Peter. Both had committed the crime of treachery to their Master, and both repented. But the repentance of one sprung from grief at his self-degradation, which made him shame-faced and horror-stricken in his own presence, and being centred in self could not reawaken the loyalty of friendship. The repentance of the other was inspired by unselfish love of his Master; his sorrow transcended self; he grieved rather for the injustice done to and the pain inflicted on a friend than for the baseness of character which his crime had laid bare. The ever-abiding consciousness of his own baseness he would gladly have

borne, might he thereby undo his disloyalty. Judas, had he lived and acquired wealth and the contentment that his nature would have found in wealth, might have been capable of altruism; Peter alone of the two was capable of a personal love for his fellow-man. Hawthorne in his *Blithedale Romance* delineates with the touches of a master's pencil the soul, the workings and the fruits of altruism and charity. In the characters of Hollingsworth and Priscilla are respectively depicted the all-devouring egotism of the philanthropist with his heartless devotion to the amelioration of humanity and the strength of human tenderness and love on which Hollingsworth leaned when his altruism had wrought evil for himself and ruin for Zenobia. Hollingsworth's sense of duty was sterile because it was impersonal, and inhuman because it was without heart.

Himself unto himself he sold;
Upon himself himself did feed,
Quiet, dispassionate and cold.

Altruism is the virtue of the narrow aristocrat of whatever species, who aloft in his superior sphere drops the crumbs of his superfluity to the needy of a lower plane, and never casts his bread upon the water that he does not expect it to come back to him in the comfortable glow of proud beneficence, in increased popularity, or in security for vested interests which the less fortunate might disturb, if they did not sometimes receive a dole of loaves and fishes. Charity is the virtue of democracy, when the spirit of democracy is animated not by the cant of political theorists, but by living belief in the brotherhood of man. When men's minds are profoundly convinced and their hearts feel that other men have the same nature as their own, however obscured by the artificial and conventional distinctions of class or the accidental differences of race, are created for the same ultimate purpose and communion in the same destiny, and have as a consequence the same essential rights and the same dignity of personality, the lawyer's question, "Who is my neighbor?" is answered. When, furthermore, they have brought home to themselves the truth that men, being made coheirs with Christ, have become adopted sons of God, the brotherhood of man will cease to be an emotional metaphor.

Civilization, therefore, will grow or decay in proportion as justice and mutual benevolence or legality and altruism are the virtues that characterize the individuals that constitute it.

II.

The adequate purpose of education, so far as it regards the present life, is to form citizens, that is to say, men and women

capable of promoting progress and enriching civilization. If that be not the purpose of it, it is hard to see why the State should attach so much importance to it. It should aim, therefore, at procuring the development of powers and the formation of habits that secure and enlarge prosperity, and at evolving the faculties and virtues that humanize feeling, widen outlooks and elevate ideals. But undoubtedly its paramount aim should be to fit youth for civilization, that is to say, for life in a civil community. However adapted a young man may have become as the result of education to increase wealth, if he be unsuited to live in the fellowship of justice and benevolence with other men, his education is worse than a failure; it is likely to be a disaster to himself and a menace to society. If the scope of education is narrowed to the production of a highly efficient dollar-hunting animal, or if this be the predominant scope, the material well-being of the community is provided for at the sacrifice of its social well-being. A man so trained may observe the law of the land without being a *civis*. He may be legally a citizen with the right to vote and to be voted for; but he is not necessarily a citizen in the ethical sense. Men may be induced to observe the law from one of three motives: self-interest, fear of superior physical force, or love of righteousness. And unless observance of law springs from this last as the dominant motive, we may have "honored and respected citizens" who are clear-sighted enough to see that their business enterprises are more secure under the reign of law, and that it is on the whole to their advantage to avoid incurring the risk of legal penalties; but not men possessing the moral attributes of citizenship. Such men may be law-abiding in appearance and to the outward eye of the State. If circumstances arise, however, in which they may with impunity violate the law, and appropriate to themselves some of the fat of the land, there are in their code of ethics no principles prohibiting action. Take away the love of righteousness as a motive of conduct and a civil community becomes a pestilential congregation of freebooters, who have adopted some "laws of the game," keep up some appearances of well-behaved propriety, and publicly profess theoretic adherence to some principles of right. Now righteousness is a moral quality. An education, therefore, which does not primarily aim at the development of the child's moral nature and which does not ultimately effect this development, whatever other merits it may have, has this drawback, that it tends to produce a type of character against whom society must be constantly on its guard, and to whom the laws of God and man are tolerable only in so far as they subserve his personal interests, and failing in this are to be observed only when he cannot, through mental adroitness acquired from

education, devise subterfuges and deceits to avoid their sanctions. Can this be the end to be attained through education?

A man whose moral nature has been undeveloped, or by defective educational processes impaired, is a social nonconformist whose unfitness for civil life, and therefore for civilization, increases in proportion as his intellectual powers are enlarged. A political controversy which has recently engaged the attention of the country will illustrate the principle which I have just enunciated. On the concrete merits of that controversy I have, of course, nothing to say. Under that aspect it has no bearing on my subject, belongs, moreover, to the domain of practical politics, and there it may remain so far as I am concerned. I am only using as an illustration the principles that underlie the controversy and which are assented to by both political parties. Whatever the political allegiance of an American citizen, he admits as a fundamental and essential characteristic of our Government the distribution of supreme political power in three different departments, and accepts as final the advice of Washington, who warns us in his farewell address to see to it that those entrusted with the legislative, judicial, and executive powers confine themselves to their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the power of one department encroachment upon that of another. When the legislature is wise and prudent, the judiciary just and fearless, the executive strong and temperate we have good government. But if any of these supreme powers loses its proper virtue, or permits the usurpation of its functions by another, then the organic unity of the State is deranged, and a first step has been taken, the logical issue of which is either anarchy or despotism.

Now the human soul is a republic whose legislative power is intellect, whose judicial power is conscience, and whose executive power is the will. Each of these powers in the soul of a child demands a training in keeping with its own nature and its relation to the other powers. The enfeebling, defective unfolding or stunting of any of them will result as disastrously for the individual as the weakening of the analogous civil powers will for the State. If the result of education is to leave the republic of the soul with a conscience that is undeveloped or corrupted, or a will that is egoistic, arbitrary and overpowering, or an intellect that has become subservient to the lawless movements of the will, an individual has been produced who is unfit for citizenship in a civilized community and is suited only for anarchy or despotism. And if millions of such citizens are annually produced in a nation, it requires no vision of a seer to foresee the outcome. History tells us of no greater scourges of humanity, of no men less fit for social and civic life

than those men who use their powers of intellect to contrive means of carrying into execution the mandates of a will uncontrolled by conscience. And experience teaches us that the social evils that threaten the peace and security of a people are rooted ultimately in the fact that the due balance between the powers of conscience, will, and intellect have been disturbed; that conscience has been corrupted or malformed, and intellect made the slave of lawless will. Any system of education, therefore, which does not aim at such a correlated development of the child's will, conscience and intellect as shall habituate it to confine these powers within "their respective constitutional spheres" is an education which has excluded the ideals of civilization from the scope of its attainment. We may train the intellect to cleverness, ingenuity and subtlety; we may inspire the will with an eager desire to compass material well-being, honor, seats in high places; but if we exclude from our school the systematic and rational training of conscience, no plethora of books or horde of pedagogical writers can obscure the fact that we do not know what education is. Unless, therefore, the child has been taught to regulate its desires and the movements of its will by the dictates of right reason and the judgments of a sound conscience, the man will subordinate righteousness to the prosecution of his personal purposes. He may as a result of education have acquired the sagacity that unerringly apprehends a remote and materially valuable end, skill in adapting means to its attainment, and energy and despatch in their use—and these qualities are undoubtedly worth acquiring; but without an inward sense of probity to rule and control his conduct in the employment of the natural and human agencies which he manipulates, they become the forces through which all that is finest within him grows coarse. He may attain a commanding position in commercial, financial, administrative or political arenas, but his very success creates for the community a civic ideal that is false and harmful.

III.

I said that the child should be taught to govern itself by the dictates of right reason and the judgments of a sound conscience. The reason is not difficult to find. For the moral conduct of life we require: first, general principles of right and wrong, which the intellect recognizes as expressions of a supreme law to which unconditional obedience is due, and secondly, rectitude of mind in applying these precepts of morality to the individual and concrete circumstances of life. There are as a consequence in the education of a child two elements—the inculcation of right principles of conduct

and of solid grounds for the obligation of conforming daily actions to principles; and the formation of an intellectual habit whereby one so reverences moral laws as to make application of them unerringly, and on motives that are superior to though not necessarily independent of personal considerations. Therefore, knowledge not only of what is right and what is wrong, but also of the ultimate reasons why one ought to do the right and avoid the wrong; and reverence, or a sense of awe in the presence of moral obligation, are the essential elements in the education of a rational being and in the formation of a citizen in a civilized state. These two, knowledge and reverence, have been recognized by every clear thinker since the days of Plato as the cardinal forces of education. The need of reverence in education, its complementary character in relation to knowledge, its necessity for civic life, is an oft-repeated theme, especially of his dialogues on the Republic and on Laws. Tennyson utters the aim and the aspiration of every true teacher in the familiar verses:

Let knowledge grow from more to more,
But more of reverence in us dwell;
That mind and soul, according well,
May make one music as before,
But vaster.

With regard to the first element there is little difficulty so far as the content of morality is concerned. It is only when there is question of its form, of determining the why and wherefore of its obligatory character that confusion, vacillation and incertitude arise. The spirit of Christianity has so pervaded our moral atmosphere that the *zeitgeist*, though it distorts and rejects its doctrinal teachings, cannot cast off the moral precepts of which those teachings are the basis. The canons of right and wrong which Christianity has fixed have in the main become the principles of our civilization, and are accepted theoretically at least even by those to whom the dogmas of Christianity are foolishness and a stumbling block. Even systems of morality which are thoroughly anti-Christian in substance and bent endeavor to adjust themselves to the common moral sentiment of the age. The very fact that they make the attempt at sacrifices of logical consistency, and of what they would call scientific precision proves that the spirit of Christianity has yet a hold on the soul, although in many quarters it has lost its influence over the reason. As a rule the ideals of righteousness which the religion of Christ presented to a world that unaided reason had betrayed into moral and religious degradation, are by subtle and informal inferences known and intellectually felt to be the substructure and support of our civilization. These ideals in their higher shape are not, it is true, received except as beautiful forms of religious poetry,

counsels of perfection, which we contemplate with devout emotion, or with which we embellish our pulpit oratory; but which in stern practice that neoteric deity called the Spirit of the Age, with its triune feature of profit, honor, pleasure, declares offensive to modern ears. And it must furthermore be confessed that even the imperatives of that ideal are sometimes and with regard to some lines of conduct stammeringly and hesitatingly spoken by the exponents and advocates of the age's morality. The fervent discourse of many a preacher and the eloquent page of many a moralist, when looked at closely, will be found to resolve itself into the confession of Jeremiah, before the Lord put forth His hand and touched his mouth: "Ah, ah, ah, Lord God; behold I cannot speak, for I am a child." Nevertheless, making these concessions, it must be admitted that the impress of Christianity is on our moral standards in so far as they exhibit precepts of conduct.

But when it comes to determining the ultimate and cogent reason of obedience to those precepts the failure of modern ethics is impressive, and would be appalling, if the law that is written in the heart of man could be wholly obliterated, and the "light which enlighteneth every man that cometh into this world" could be extinguished. The word "ought" has been either wholly or nearly emptied of significance by the ethical writers who represent this age. At best the reason advanced for declaring a given action or course of conduct good or just, and its omission bad or unjust, may be such as to compel assent of the intellect; but they cannot exact the unconditional obedience of the will. The necessity they produce is logical, not moral. If we demand why we ought to do what is just, humane, or virtuous, and why we ought not to do what is unjust, inhumane or vicious, we are given answers which show that either the nature of the question is not apprehended, or that the word "ought" has lost its distinctive meaning. Why ought I to do what I know to be right? Why may I not, if I find it agreeable, profitable, and sometimes even respectable, indulge in wrong conduct, provided I am well-bred, prudent and temperate? Why must I, even when it is disagreeable or entails danger and sacrifice, walk in the narrow path of rectitude? No system of Eudaimonism gives an answer. He who tells me that right conduct is obligatory because it promotes happiness, is ennobling, advances the interests of humanity or is required for the welfare of the State has simply failed to apprehend the initial problem of Ethics; he has not even assigned a universal and objective norm of right and wrong, let alone an ultimate ground of obligation. Nor does any system of rational Deontology give an answer, though this may be said to the credit of such systems, they do not debase or nullify absolutely the concept

of moral law. All of them, however, from Kant with his autonomous reason, which is endowed with the power of furnishing categorical imperatives when occasion demands, to Hegel, with his statolatry and pantheistic reconstruction of Hobbes' "great Leviathan," leave the superstructure of morality hanging like the Hindoo turtle in mid-air. They either invest man himself through some faculty with authority to command himself, or they create out of abstractions a figmen which they christen Humanity, or the State, and whose mandates they ask us, after making an act of faith in its existence and sanctity, to accept as obligatory.

Now it is a fact, I think, which conversation and observation will confirm, that most men outside of those whose inner life is governed by Christianity, are to-day utilitarians in their personal practice of morality, some of them actually Benthamites,* and Kantians or Hegelians in the principles they profess when on parade, and in the standards they set up for others. Many of them may never have read a page of Bentham, or Mill, or Kant, or Hegel; but they have imbibed the views and principles of those writers from newspapers, novels, and magazines and in the intercourse and competitions of business and social life. Yet, unless the precepts of morality impose an unconditional obligation on the will, and unless the source of that obligation is a being, real and actually existing who is superior to man individually and collectively and on whom man is absolutely dependent, it is impossible to think of morality as anything else than a precarious scheme of behavior, somewhat more universal in its reach than the conventions of good society. It does not, of course, fall within the scope of this paper to discuss the value of modern systems of Ethics. Nor is such discussion really needed. The complete breakdown of these systems is known to every one whose duty it is to become acquainted with them and is now nearly universally admitted by ethical scholars. They have multiplied books and like the friends of Job they "have wrapped up sentences in unskillful words" with the sole intention of establishing moral obligation without admitting the existence of *One* who alone can bind in conscience a human will, and the only success they have

* Bentham in a posthumous work, curiously entitled *Deontology*, declares: "It is, in fact, idle to talk about *duties*; the word itself has in it something disagreeable and repulsive; and talk about it as we may, the word (*etc*) will not become a rule of conduct. . . . Every man is thinking about *interests*. It is a part of his very nature to think about interests. . . . To interest duty must and will be made subservient." And again: "The talisman of arrogance, indolence and ignorance is to be found in a single word, an authoritative impostor, which in these papers it will be frequently necessary to unvell. It is the word, 'ought'—'ought' or 'ought not,' as circumstances may be. . . . If the use of the word be admissible at all, it *ought* to be banished from the vocabulary of morals."

attained consists in confusing men's thoughts, and in preparing the way for moral skepticism, and in imposing intolerable burdens on those whose profession obliges them to keep acquainted with their adversaries' briefs. The modern spirit is like the children of some millionaire fathers who enjoy superbly the fruits of the wealth they did not produce, and would like to thrust the creator of it as far as possible into the social background. It is rather an ignoble spirit, immeasurably so when the object of its aversion is the infinite and ineffable reality from whose all-bountiful goodness spring being and the dowries thereof. Being ignoble it cannot elaborate a morality that will appeal to the deep inherent instincts of the soul, or satisfy those primal cravings of it for holiness and righteousness that proclaim its kinship with the Deity.

It may be galling to the devotees of the modern spirit to base their morality on God and religion. But until they do so it shall possess neither stability nor fruition. Until two fundamental positions are admitted there is no possibility of teaching morality effectively. These are: first, certain modes of conduct are the expressions of an absolute exemplar of conduct, the impress of which is found in our rational natures; and, secondly, the Being of whom our nature is an image, and on whom it depends primarily for its origin, and ultimately for its final perfection, necessarily wills and ordains that only actions fully in accord with the exigencies of our nature are lawful, or, what is the same thing, that conduct *ought* to be in conformity with the absolute exemplar. This concept of morality entails the admission of a supreme legislator, to whom we owe absolute obedience, and involves Ethics with religion. It is therefore distasteful to the modern spirit which desires to construct a system of morality independent of God, and to inculcate duty without obtruding the disagreeable idea of obligation. But if there is any necessity of teaching morality to secure the true happiness of the individual, the safety of the State, and the well-being of the race, there is the same necessity of teaching religion, the existence, namely, of a Supreme Being, who manifests to us through our higher faculties the decrees of His eternal law.

Nor is it enough to know what is right or wrong, and why we ought to do the right and avoid the wrong, in order to render morality effective and enduring. Reverence must increase and consummate knowledge. Knowledge as such appeals only to the intellect; unless invested with something that touches the heart it has no motive power over the will. Bare truth of itself is incapable of arousing an emotion, of inspiring a purpose, or of impelling to action. Of whatever kind it may be it does not differ in its influence on the conative faculty from a perfectly demon-

strated proposition of geometry. Man is more than a reasoner; he is a doer, and as such an emotional being. Unless a known truth therefore is clothed with a quality that approves it to the will, it cannot become a motive of action.

Now reverence is an intellectual emotion, complementing the knowledge of divine law and impelling to its observance. On its intellectual side it arises from a *quasi* intuitive apprehension of the excellence of another, when the elements of that excellence are superior power and worth. Power without worth we may fear, and worth without power we may respect and honor; but neither of them singly do we reverence. It is only when the two excellences are simultaneously perceived to be the conjoined attributes of another, that the rational ground of the emotion called reverence is present. Evidently, therefore, reverence primarily and directly regards a person, appreciation of whom does not spring from, but transcends the formal processes of deductive or inductive reasoning, although in balanced and receptive intellects it will often accompany the conclusions of such reasoning when concerned with the nature or character of a person. We do not feel reverence towards an abstraction nor toward a work of nature or art, however beautiful, imposing, or sublime they may be, except in so far as contemplation of them excites to reverence for him whom they represent, or whose supremacy and excellence they attest. On its emotional side reverence is a mingled feeling, responding to the two personal attributes by which it is awakened. To reverence is to hold in awe because of superior power and in highest honor because of superior worthiness. The awe of reverence is not fear, since it arises from no threat or anticipation of impending evil, and is compatible with the highest degree of love. St. Paul tells us that Christ, as man, offered prayer and supplication to His Heavenly Father and "was heard for His reverence;" in Him, however, there could have been no fear of God. It may coexist with hope realized and a sense of spiritual elevation, as in the blessed who enjoy the beatific vision of God and adore Him in reverence. In fact, reverence necessarily includes some measure of love for the person revered, and some degree of spiritual elevation in the person reverencing. Yet a feeling akin to fear undoubtedly forms an element of this emotion. The very word by which it is denominated is borrowed from the Latin term which etymologically connotes fear. It is not, however, the fear of dread or terror, but the fear of humility and modesty, the rational self-abasement arising from conscious inferiority to another, mingled with care and prudent apprehension regarding the outcome of any act or course of conduct of which the person revered may become cognizant. Hence the word used by St.

Paul in the original text of his Epistle to the Hebrews to designate the reverence of Christ for His Heavenly Father signifies cautious and scrupulous regard in conduct for the will of another.

IV.

In the human conscience reverence attains its holiest and most sacred expression. Through conscience man knows himself to be in presence of a Being of surpassing power and incomparable worthiness, of whom he stands in awe and for whom he feels the highest form of respect; knows, furthermore, that its dictates and injunctions are the authoritative voice of that Being. Conscience, therefore, does not simply apply the precepts of morality to individual cases, in much the same way, for instance, as reason might apply the general principles of a mechanical science to the solution of a particular problem of construction or engineering. It does this and more. It reveals the fact that these precepts are the ordinances of a supreme personal legislator to whom unconditional obedience is due, not because of the sanctions decreed for observing or transgressing His commands, but because of His sovereign right to reverence. The need, therefore, of inculcating reverence for the formation of character is as evident as the necessity of training conscience for the same purpose. There are some who, without due analysis of their own thought, I think, and full realization of the consequences of their own theories, have denied this, in maintaining that the principle of authority should be excluded from the class room. Yet no one acquainted with the psychology of the human soul can seriously contend that mere knowledge or intellectual development is of itself sufficient for the right formation of character. Such a thesis is, moreover, constantly disproved by the records of our criminal courts, and the efforts of our legislators to devise laws which will effectively restrain intelligent and expert lawlessness. Unless reverence be the result of education—reverence for God and the truths and commands and ways of God; reverence for all forms of authority, parental, civil and ecclesiastical; reverence for the family, the hallowed associations of home, the sanctity of the marriage bond and its sacred obligations; reverence for the neighbor, the dignity of his personality and the inviolability of his rights; reverence for ourselves, for our bodies that are the tabernacles of our souls, and for our souls that are made to the image and likeness of God—unless, I say, reverence for all things worthy of reverence be so inculcated in childhood and youth as to become a habit of manhood, education is worse than a failure; it is an unparalleled misfortune. It has left the republic of the soul without

a tribunal of right and wrong and without a judicial power to enjoin and compel execution. It has made wisdom, which is knowledge acquired under the elevating and vitalizing influence of reverence, an alien to science, and the higher ranges of truth an unknown or barren region.

But to fashion the minds of the young to habits of reverence conscience must be educated, since the reverence of conscience is the norm and exemplar of all reverence. Conscience cannot be educated without teaching morality. Morality cannot be taught unless religion is part of the curriculum of the school. There is no more possibility of teaching moral obligation without teaching the existence of a supreme legislator than there is of teaching the duty of filial love without admitting the fact of a father. There may be men, who from motives of worldly prudence or from temperament conform their lives in the main to those dictates of morality which regard their relations to other men, at least in so far as their lives are open to the inspection of the public. But men normally observe the whole law of morality only from motives of religion, and oftentimes in spite of temperament and the suggestions of worldly prudence. Unquestionably it is an historical fact that the morality of a people degenerates into some form of hedonism, utilitarianism or stoicism when not based on religion. It is equally certain that if religion is not taught in childhood and youth, its influence over conduct in later life will be problematic. Unless, therefore, religion supplies a fundamental law or constitution under which the republic of the soul lives, the intellect may know and proclaim, haltingly it is true and with some errors, the law of right and wrong which is inscribed in the heart, but there is no judicatory of conscience to keep the executive power of will from going outside its "constitutional sphere."

Briefly, if the paramount aim of education, so far as the State is concerned, is to fit the growing generation for future citizenship in a civilized community, the question proposed at the beginning of this paper reduces itself to this: What evidence is there in the disciplines and instructions of our schools and in the type of character which they develop that our voluminous educational literature has contributed to the ideals of civilization? If true citizens cannot be formed without inculcating morality, what indications are there that our copious pedagogical writers have aided in the formation of upright and conscientious citizens? If integrity of character and unselfish devotion to social responsibilities and civil duties are not normally found apart from religious convictions, what proofs are there that our schools through the persuasive wisdom of modern educators have furthered our religious life as a people? These are

definite questions. It may be denied that it is the purpose of our schools to form citizens in the adequate sense of that term. It may be contended that the training of conscience is not an element in the education of a citizen. It may be maintained that conscience can be trained without moulding the soul of a child or youth to habits of reverence. And one or other of these positions is in fact concealed in the public proclamations of many who have discussed this question of education. But if none of them can be held, the question which I propose can be answered categorically by ingenuously looking at facts. I shall attempt an answer to it in the next issue of this magazine.

TIMOTHY BROSNAHAN, S. J.

Woodstock, Md.

CATHOLICITY AND SOCIALISM.

IT IS difficult to estimate accurately any complex system of thought or of policy. It is doubly difficult to compare and then judge two complex systems of thought and policy. There is danger of mistaking accidental for essential, relative for absolute; of seeing what one looks for instead of what is to be found; of unfairly comparing best in one with worst in the other, where the systems are antagonistic, and of failing to see the actual difficulties inherent in a position which one holds. It is difficult, therefore, to compare Catholicity and Socialism. Yet it is necessary. The two systems of thought and policy are disposing forces for a contest, already well under way, and the world is not large enough for the supremacy of both as they now stand.

The question of method in the study of the two is important. Brownson, in writing of Liberalism and Socialism in 1855, said: "To rightly comprehend a system is not simply to detect its errors. We understand not even an erroneous system till we understand its truth; and its real refutation lies not so much in detecting and exposing its fallacies as in detecting, distinguishing and accepting the truth which it misapprehends, misinterprets or misapplies. Socialism commends itself to the intellect of its adherents only in the respect that it is true, and to their hearts only in the respect that it is good. . . . If we wish to produce a favorable effect on them and to refute their system for their sake, we must begin, not by denouncing their error, but by showing them that we recognize and accept their truth." Later in the same essay he says:

"But when erroneous systems are in arms or arming themselves against society, we do not think it the proper time to draw attention to their side of truth and goodness, for it is then a more urgent duty to defeat them and save society from the ruin they threaten than it is to labor to convert their adherents from their errors."¹

While the type of Socialism that Brownson saw was quite unlike the types that we now meet, his words contain suggestions which have value for us to-day. We must be active against organized Socialism, but the activity should not be allied with unfairness, ridicule or disregard of our own difficulties.

The situation of the Church is interesting. She opposes vigorously organized Socialism and defends the present social order. And yet there is very much in the facts, tendencies and principles of to-day which she must repudiate and even condemn. The Church is not a welcome companion in the company of the nations. England shows a record of scorn, oppression and fury against her, and middle-aged men remember the awful hate awakened when the hierarchy was restored. France despoils, persecutes, banishes, suppresses institutions through which the Church acts. Germany has not yet lived down the memory of the *Kulturkampf*. Italy, Switzerland, Russia show little friendliness for her, and while in this country our institutions aim to be fair, we may not ignore the actual spirit of opposition to the Church manifested in many ways. In a word, the administration of modern governments show relatively little regard for the Church as a power in the social order. Secondly, the Church sees in our modern institutions and liberties a number of principles which she would not and could not teach as they are now accepted. Modern science is frankly against the main philosophy of life on which the Church rests. Our educational system violates her fundamental view of what education means. The modern State has encroached on the jurisdiction claimed by the Church. The main tendencies of society are worldly and perilous to her. And yet, in spite of all in modern life that is against her, in spite of governments and principles and tendencies, the Church appears as the defender of this social order, stands against Socialism, the enemy of this order, and demands sanction for law, respect for authority and protection for institutions, without thought of resentment or motive of gain, without commission from those she would save or reward from those she would serve. Uninfluenced by what is undeniably attractive in Socialism and undeterred by what is unmistakably against her in the present order, she is animated by a conviction that transcends both and looks to the ethical and spiritual beyond. It is worth while to attempt

¹ *Works*, Vol. X.

a study of the relations of Catholicity and Socialism with a view to understand their relations.

TWO PHILOSOPHIES OF LIFE.

Ordinarily we understand best those things which we can translate into the terms of our own experience. As in logic, so in life, we proceed to the unknown from the known. When we are conscious of our experiences, when we correlate and interpret the facts of every day life, the things we feel, the things we do, and those we suffer, resist or surrender to, we grow in insight, judgment and power. The laboring man who understands the facts in his own life, who measures the forces which affect his wages, his home, his work; who observes, compares, judges what his employers and his fellow-workers say and think and do, is a thinker, and he has a philosophy. Through the understanding of his own experience he is able to understand those about him. Interchange of views, similarity of experience, of circumstances, of culture, build up a class view, with estimates of social forces and laws.

Few men understand thoroughly their own lives. Many live and work and die who never interpret, never compare, never rise above the dull monotony of physical existence. Some men are awake and thoughtful, but as successful as they care to be. Others, discontented, eager, become conscious of themselves and of the facts in life. They study, interpret, think. The fact that two men are hod-carriers and work side by side does not make them mutually companions, while the hod-carrier and the bank cashier who feel alike and think alike will show the frankest mutual sympathy and delight in exchange of views.

A very large number of men are now thinking, interpreting the everyday facts of life, recognizing forces at work and reading contrasts which these forces create. An active propaganda has created abundant literature, and zealous teachers work constantly. The life of the individual is the text-book, and the facts in his life furnish question, illustration and answer. Universal education, the habit of general reading with some leisure for it, the press, the habit of expressing thought, a bold, fearless spirit of criticism and advocacy are circumstances which add meaning to the movement. The spirit of this tendency has brought personal experience prominently forward as the criterion of life; and individual men and women are induced, taught, encouraged to judge government, religion, institutions by and through their own personal experience of them rather than by a large impersonal social standard. The most marked products of this process are trades unions and Socialism.

Socialism is a philosophy of life based on life. It is an interpretation and coördination of the facts in the individual laborer's life. And since the industrial process, machinery and business have made the main facts in most laborers' lives identical, these understand one another readily. Socialism explains to the laborer his wages, his home circumstances, his struggles, his aspirations, his compulsory self-denial; it explains the character and actions of his employers, the luxury, the extravagance of the rich, the corruption of politics. The things which the laborer sees most clearly and can best understand are thus coördinated to construct a view of life. Socialism uses the laborer's vocabulary; it tells him things felt but not expressed; it speaks in ways that he understands, and hence becomes in this day of agitation, aspiration, discontent and awakened intelligence a philosophy of life based on life experience; an explanation to the laboring man of his personal life history, and an appeal to him to realize his happiness through its direction.

There is another philosophy of life and society which we learn not from life, but from books, teachers, history. Religion, government, school, social authorities generally teach us a systematic philosophy which disciplines and directs life. We have now not philosophy drawn from life, as with Socialism, but life subjected to a philosophy. The great principles of this philosophy are drawn from history, from estimates of the courses of nations and peoples, and, in the case of Christianity, from divine revelation; more true and safe because thus derived. But these social and religious principles, derived as they are from race experience (or in the case of religion, directed to race needs), are not based on the current experience of individuals. We who learn this philosophy acquire it by study, not through life and living, and many are content to learn it in a purely formal way. We may give our assent without testing, may argue without doubting, prove without convincing and expound without adjusting to changed conditions. Schools are not life, they are inventions, hence the philosophy of life taught in them does not always become as real as one might wish, nor does it always enlist sympathy as one might expect.

It is wonderful to see how men do accept and hold political, social and religious principles and do submit to the personal discipline entailed; how they have curbed emotions, corrected ambitions, sustained distress and practiced patience in obedience to a philosophy so difficult to understand and so severe to follow. But, on the other hand, it gives cause for concern to see the extent to which men are withdrawing from the spirit and from the letter of that law and gradually drifting into the other. Complex processes are everywhere casting doubt into minds big enough to receive it, but

not strong enough to overcome it; minds active enough to understand their worth, but too small to see their limitations; broad enough to see one class and its interests, but not deep enough to see all classes and all interests.

For present purposes we may call Socialism the summa of one philosophy and Catholicity the summa of the other.

All forms of social discontent are sympathetic with one another. It is not surprising to find moral discontent allied with intellectual, or industrial, associated with political. One is interested when one finds spelling reform in an anarchist sheet, and cooking reform and dress reform in a socialist colony. The vocabulary, temper, methods, experience of most kinds of reform are identical, as in all cases there is revolt against an established order.

Complex as Socialism is, there is in it little that is distinctive or distinctively new. It is a new coördination of many old things, or of things which are not essential to it. The atheism of many Socialists other than those who adhere to Marx and his philosophy is but a fraction of the atheism of modern society, found high and low, among learned and ignorant. And this atheism is generated by forces distinct from Socialism, but acting possibly parallel to it. The free love nonsense affected by many Socialists is only a fraction of the free love practice and quiet belief of large numbers who are encouraged by the diminishing respect for the family and its defense. The home succeeded by flat and boarding house, work of mothers and children, loss of family traditions, divorce, weakening of the family tie brought on by constantly moving from place to place; the school assuming functions which the parent gladly surrenders, falling marriage and birth rate—all these things weaken the family and lead to the loose sentiment so widely expressed. Hence forces distinct from Socialism are attacking marriage and the home. Socialism acquires honestly its impulse to revolution, since revolution had its share in giving the world some of the modern constitutions and modern liberties.

Socialism's economic theory was learned from the most orthodox masters. Its notion of equality and fraternity was learned from the social order that it threatens; its philosophy of history is from Hegel. Its collectivism is distinctive, the proposal to socialize capital being its essential tenet. Not Socialism, but the age, favors atheism, loosens the bonds of the family, challenges authority and taught false economics. Socialism has united, systematized fragments of discontent into a coherent philosophy, and this philosophy is so close to the facts of life, so satisfying to one who looks at present merely and not at past or future, at individual or class, and not at race; it is so soothing in the freedom from self-

discipline which it promises that it is a real vital power to its believers.

A recent writer has said: "Among the Stoics every man was a Stoic. But among the Christians, where are the Christians?" The Socialist is always a Socialist. Is the Christian always a Christian? The former understands his lessons well, can argue vigorously, is eloquent, certain, aggressive, dogmatic, since his emotions, feelings and sympathy are all engaged. The Christian laborer is not so well equipped in his philosophy, since its principles and its methods are difficult. In a way, he is led to resist the advance of Socialism on account of his personal attachment to the Church. He may be temperamentally opposed to Socialism, as millions are, but the strength of the Catholic system against it will depend on the perception of the Church's definite attitude toward it. We are called upon, therefore, to develop a Catholic attitude, a Catholic literature, a Catholic judgment of the issue. The situation to-day is in some respects similar to that referred to by Newman when speaking, in 1840, of Methodism while still an Anglican:

"Had it been met with a definite theology, with an analysis of its errors and a precise discrimination of what was true in it from what was false, its supporters would have felt that the Church had a meaning in its words, and they would have been necessarily thrown on the defensive; but the vague, unsystematic mode in which they were encountered did but create in their minds an impression of their own superiority; as if their own view must necessarily be taken by all who would be religious, for none other could be found."²

SOCIAL ORDERS.

A social order is a definite arrangement of men in society according to rights, duties and relations, all of which rest on a fundamental conception of man. Institutions, states, religions, laws, social conventions return in final analysis to an estimate of man. Changes in this estimate bring progress or retrogression, clashes between different estimates bring revolutions. One conception of man gives us absolute monarchy, another gives us democracy. We see now in the bitter struggle in Russia the efforts of a new estimate to establish itself and to change institutions.

There is a religious estimate of man derived from the teachings of Christ. According to it man is spiritual, destined for future life. Men are children of the Father in heaven, brothers in Jesus Christ. All rights, relations, duties flow from this estimate, as do all proportions among values in life. The fundamental social law of

² *Essays, Critical and Historical*, I., p. 412.

Christ is that strength shall serve weakness. Dependence and independence appear providentially, and God's law is, to sanctify the latter through its service of the former. Riches serve poverty, learning serves ignorance, health serves disease, the high serve the lowly, the free serve the enslaved, the virtuous serve the sinning. Christ Himself, the source of knowledge, power, grace, liberty, served man, who was poor, defiled, degraded, ignorant and enslaved. He, the mighty one, placed the weak and tender child as model, as ideal for the strong who would seek His kingdom. On this law of God the social order should rest. The virtues are the laws of that kingdom, grace is power, sin is evil. Mercy, kindness, truth, together with faith, charity, justice and self-denial, should govern life, and that government should express the will of God. And all life should express that law—civil, social, industrial, intellectual institutions should safeguard and develop it, because all life is referred to it and all institutions are destined to protect it.

There is a political order, expressing another estimate of man. It is incomplete and mainly negative, as a rule favoring the greatest degree of personal liberty as shown in the modern State. Men are called free and equal, and the State should leave them so by equally protecting all who have equal rights. Classes are formed by nature, by voluntary agreement or by law; the State looks upon the individual as sharing the status of his class and fixes his legal rights and duties accordingly. But in the main he is left to himself and encouraged to self-reliance and personal endeavor. This political conception falls far short of the spiritual view and fails to enact it.

Beyond the two orders mentioned we have the industrial order, which has assumed such commanding importance in our day. Man is wealth-producing, wealth-possessing. Institutions exist largely to sanction rights and duties springing from property relations. The removal of restraint, due to the negative attitude of the State toward religion and industry left man to the play of industrial forces. Development has been such that the selfish motive is dominant to-day and the law of the industrial world is that weakness shall serve strength. The strong have become powerful, and strength has returned to its pagan habit of self-seeking; the weak have been weakened, and weakness renders compulsory service to strength.

These three conceptions of man coexist to-day. The Christian law that strength shall serve weakness is maintained by Christian churches, but without legal sanction, support or social promulgation. The political principle that men who are equal are equal before the law and are regarded neither as strong nor as weak, is

adhered to as faithfully as can be by the State. But in fact the industrial order is dominant, and its law that weakness shall serve strength is to an extent supreme. Representatives of religion teach and appeal and organize to conquer the situation, with but partial success; States, as far as their traditions permit, enact laws to protect the weak, to curb the strong, but disappointing patchwork results. We see few traces of the Christian principle in the business or industrial order; little mercy, kindness, service, brotherly love; little serving of weakness by strength. Representatives of the industrial order are powerful in legislation and in government, shaping laws, hindering restrictions and securing advantages. State and Church are fighting against that supremacy, and every variety of reform now seen in society is merely an aspect of the struggle.

Out of the turmoil and conflict a fourth conception of man is arising, and it makes a powerful appeal. It is voiced by Socialism, offering a definite conception of man, his right and duties and proposing a definite social order to realize it. Allowing for variations honestly admitted by Socialists, we may say that they aim at an approach to equality among men. The strong should be disciplined and the weak strengthened, with a view to make men equal. This equality should have its basis in the material order. All institutions, industry, law should aim to approach and preserve equality and independence. Society would own all capital, conduct all industry, exact labor from all and return to each the maximum of what he produced. This revenue, based on personal labor, supplemented by the care of authority for general features of life, would insure comfort, independence, culture to all. Socialism assumes that present institutions are bankrupt; that the industrial order is absolutely supreme; that Church and State are enslaved to capital and interested in perpetuating its domination. The new social order proposed by Socialism rests on a new conception of man, his rights and duties, and aims to overthrow the order now established. Built up from the aspirations, life experience and feelings of those to whom the present order has brought least, the philosophy of life which Socialism teaches appeals strongly to great numbers and challenges with greatest assurance the truth, the mercy, the power of the philosophy which Church and State represent.

GENERAL SPIRITUAL TENDENCIES.

It was stated above that the industrial order is too powerful in society; that it has to a great extent overcome the Christian and the political principles which Church and State try to maintain. If we appeal to our own personal experience, each to his own daily

life, we discover readily sufficient illustration. The lack of loyalty, honor, honesty in business, in our daily buying and selling; the heartlessness of adulteration of food and medicines; frank refusal to respect humanity if profits are reduced or business threatened are so well known that we are scarcely conscious of them. Men are compelled to be selfish; the appalling prominence of the money motive in life and the physical need of possessing and accumulating it so modify motives, sympathies and pursuits that the Christian conception of life is seriously affected in nearly every aspect. Our interests, our rivalries, our plans chill the Christian feeling into torpor and leave us commercial, but not Christian. The strong and the weak are separated in sympathy, in interest, distant from one another in their places of dwelling, and both unsanctified because of that. While men as individuals may remain more or less Christian, the process of personal sanctification is endangered. The social supremacy of the material or economic principle and motive is pitted against the individual supremacy of the Christian principle and motive, with the result that the former triumphs only too often.

The Church's message is primarily to the soul. If she have aught to do with Socialism it must be because of peril to the spiritual interests of society. Does the essential notion of Socialism, namely, collective ownership of capital, contain anything, theoretically, with which Catholicity need find fault as a menace to the soul? If Catholicity antagonizes it, the reason is to be sought in its relation to faith and morals. It is well, therefore, to make a review of the spiritual situation with a view to find the tendencies of the present and the relation of Socialism to them.

1. The spiritual sense is becoming dull. The soul is not of commanding importance in modern society. Probably this complaint is always to the point, but it is surely justified now. Mind is recognized everywhere, but soul is neglected. Neither scholarship nor statesmanship nor politics nor industry nor culture is much concerned with the interests of the soul, if we except the scholarship of religion. Good morals are a social necessity, philanthropy is honorable and social service is popular, but we miss the soul from among the factors that count to-day. However the individual may believe, however earnestly he loves the spiritual and recognizes in the soul the image of God and the pledge of his dignity as man and Christian, he lives in a social order and social atmosphere where he finds it difficult to sustain his spiritual sense. The worldliness of the world, its power of attraction so multiplied by progress, the concentration, absorption and fascination of business and the need of working diligently to accumulate, to save, to provide, have

all given prominence to other features of life, to the detriment of the soul; hence the dulling of spiritual perception, the habit of directing life and shaping judgment as though there were no soul.

2. The sense of sin is becoming dull. The presence of God in the social world, the imperative supremacy of His law, the sanction of His will for individual human dignity, individual rights and obligations are not perceived with sympathy or accepted with love. Conscience remains after a fashion, but by the time that divine laws intended to guide it have penetrated the social atmosphere and reached the individual's mind they are so changed as to have lost much of their force. National conscience, political conscience, business conscience, social conscience are formed in some way that misses the presence of God and the recognition and integrity of His law. This dulling of the sense of sin may be seen in many ways. Men revise and shorten the catalogue of sins, new social processes and practices which are real sins are not so recognized, the thought that social duty has a divine sanction is neglected, the thought of God loses its social force. Sin seems not to consist in omission at all, but only in commission, and the sins of commission are fewer. Even where the law of God is known, the presence of custom, ambition, difficulties of income and strain of want, habits of self-indulgence lead to habitual violation and then to self-exculpation.

3. We find in society increasing disregard for self-discipline, self-denial, penance. In fact, it is quite unusual to mention such things in a social study. Yet the Christian cannot deny that they are prominent in the mind of Christ, central in His teaching and essential in the sanctification which He awaits in us. Not as an end, but as a means, they are part of the process by which we reproduce the spirit of Christ in us. They are necessary to us when they are needed to keep our emotions pure, our impulses unselfish, our interests loyal to God's and our love of our fellow-men active and true. When life is lived without the spirit of self-denial, penance and discipline a wrong sense of proportions establishes itself. These practices are sentinels to guard the mercy, purity, unselfishness, loyalty that Christ demands and the Christian social order presupposes. We look to our institutions, to our environment, to current philosophy for support, sympathy or sanction of these vital Christian practices, but we find indifference and neglect. Even in Christian circles, and among good Christians, the function and power of self-penance, self-denial, self-discipline are misunderstood and underrated.

4. Coördinately we discover in the spirit of the time a diminish-

ing sense of personal responsibility. Our individualism has developed wonderfully strong men, but conditions have produced many weak men. The currents of life are so strong and relations so complex that men tend to abandon themselves to the current. The strong surrender to their strength and the weak surrender to their weakness.

Hence the great cry now is environment. The weak are taught that they have no responsibility—circumstances shape them. Men, always glad to escape responsibility, too readily believe, and abandon themselves to environment. It explains sin, success, power, weakness, all things. Learned men teach this as determinism, but when it reaches the classes it is a pleasant form of escaping the sense of guilt. One finds on all sides proof of this tendency to underrate, if not ignore the sense of moral responsibility.

5. Finally we find, too, a dulling of the sense of duty as such. Everywhere we insist on getting our rights. One social class believes in its own rights and in the duties of the other classes. These believe in their rights and miss the sense of obligation. Neither rights nor duties are looked upon as spiritual things so much as social conveniences. The far-reaching social effects of this tendency may be seen in the constitution of reform movements and in the personal history of individuals.

Newman in his sermon on "The Religion of the Pharisee the Religion of Mankind" summarizes the situation in this striking manner:

"I know men profess a great deal and boast that they are Christians and speak of Christianity as being a religion of the heart; but when we put aside words and professions and try to discover what their religion is, we shall find, I fear, that the great mass of men in fact get rid of all religion that is inward; that they lay no stress on acts of faith, hope and charity, on simplicity of intention, purity of motive or mortification of the thoughts; that they confine themselves to two or three virtues, superficially practised; that they know not the words contrition, penance and pardon, and they think and argue that, after all, if a man does his duty in the world according to his vocation he cannot fail to go to heaven, however little he may do besides, nay, however much in other matters he may do that is undeniably unlawful. Thus a soldier's duty is loyalty, obedience and valor, and he may let other matters take their chance; a trader's duty is honesty; an artisan's duty is industry and contentment; of a gentleman are required veracity, courteousness and self-respect; of a public man, high-principled ambition; of a woman, the domestic virtues; of a minister of religion, decorum, benevolence and some activity. Now, all these are instances of mere Pharisaical

excellence, because there is no apprehension of Almighty God, no insight into His claims on us, no sense of the creature's shortcomings, no self-condemnation, confession and deprecation, nothing of those deep and sacred feelings which ever characterize the religion of the Christian, and more and more, not less and less, as he mounts up from mere ordinary obedience to the perfection of a saint."

These five spiritual senses, if one may so term them, are closely allied in their functions and are, in fact, variations of the simple realization of the soul's existence. The sense of the soul, of sin, of self-discipline, penance and self-denial, of personal responsibility, of duty may be considered as interdependent. If we look for evidence of the presence of these senses in our politics, our business and in our everyday dealings with others we quickly discover the tendency referred to and see to what an extent they have been dulled into the inaction that causes such concern to-day.

This condition shows us that the material order and industrial forces are predominant, and that the Christian order and Christian forces are greatly weakened. Now, spirituality of life depends on these spiritual senses. The Church expresses primarily a revealed conception of man, of God, of Christ, of men's rights, duties and relations. She has elaborated her doctrine into a system, she has evolved a ritual, a form of worship and has cultivated a system of religious emotions. The Church exists because there is a soul, because sin exists, because the Incarnation and Redemption were for sinners; because the mission of Christ is perpetual to souls. The sense of sin, the reality of the soul, the sense of penance and discipline, of responsibility, of duty are central, vital, as the duty of sanctification is supreme in life. The Church must look for the soul everywhere, judge institutions finally by their relation to it; she must foster penance, build up the spirit of Christ and aim always to win from any and all legitimate social orders sympathy and support. It is, of course, true that we may err in emphasis. When we see the soul too vividly we may neglect the body, as St. Francis did; in teaching individual responsibility we may under-rate social environment; in teaching penance we may have forgotten that comfort, too, and relaxation have their place; in teaching duty we may have said too little about rights. We may err in emphasis, but we dare not for a moment surrender the main doctrine or yield to any tendency which robs society of the very essentials of spiritual life, these spiritual senses. The Church watches, legislates, preaches, teaches to foster and save them, and she must judge civilization and institutions by effect on them.

From this standpoint the Church must, in a way, condemn the present condition of things as deeply to be regretted. And she

does. From her pulpits, her press, her scholars, her leaders, her hierarchy, her chief ruler condemnations go out daily, startling in volume and in significance. And in all proposals for reform, in every remedy suggested we find central the reawakening of the spiritual senses, duty, discipline, self-restraint, kindly service, humane love of fellow-man. The reestablishment of the soul's supremacy in life would shatter the tyranny of the material, the reawakening of brotherly love would do more than laws and States. But conditions prevent the Church's word from a fair hearing. Her constant complaint about the danger to the spiritual senses in society, her constant prayer for the restoration of the soul to its authorized primacy in life are unheeded or unheard.

The tendencies antagonistic to the spiritual senses are recognized as dangers; they are regretted, and every effort at reform, every attempt to reassert the political and humane and Christian principles against the supremacy of the selfish and material makes for the saving of those senses. There is reasonable hope that we may succeed to a fair degree. Here Catholicity enters judgment of Socialism. Whatever error in doctrine, ignorance of fact, fault in method, distortion of emphasis, malice in propaganda we may charge against Socialism, undeniably it is in the main a protest against the supremacy of the industrial order in life and an effort to equalize conditions of life for all men. Its essential tenet is collective ownership of capital—a certain, unfailing means, it is claimed, of social salvation. We may take the most extreme and hopeful form of the proposition, such, for instance, as the words of Edward Everett Hale at the world's Parliament of Religions in Chicago:³ "The twentieth century will give to every man according to his necessities. It will receive from every man according to his opportunity," or accept the most generally adopted term—socialization of capital—and still, as it stands historically, attractive as it is in many ways, Catholicity mistrusts it deeply, and I think must do so.

Catholicity represents a spiritual philosophy which is to discipline and shape life. Socialism in its least offensive form is a philosophy based on life; and the two philosophies are, here and now, to a great extent, exclusive. Socialism's philosophy certainly tends to eliminate the spiritual senses by diminishing emphasis if not always by exclusion. What Catholicity regrets and condemns as an accident and an abuse in the present order is found in Socialism enthroned as a principle and sanctioned as a law. Socialism comes with no sense of the soul's reality, no sense of sin, of discipline and penance, of individual responsibility. Its analysis of social wrongs omits sin as

³ Report, Vol. I., p. 524.

a factor, its constructive reform contemplates no spiritual power, no reassertion of the supremacy of God and the sanctity of His law. Naturally the type of Socialism known as Christian is not included in this statement. It would require special treatment from a scriptural point of view.

Differences of emphasis easily merge into differences of doctrine. It seems fair to say against Socialism that its exaggerated emphasis of body over soul, of comfort over grace, of environment over personal responsibility, of institution over sin; its professed attempt to make life self-sufficient and to arrange its values without reference to a hereafter, equal in fact difference of doctrine between it and Catholicity. We may hear many Socialists who are spiritually minded protest that this statement is unfair. One would welcome a fairer statement if one found it. The first difference, then, that we note is one of emphasis; Catholicity emphasizing future life, soul, sin, self-discipline, individual responsibility, duty; Socialism emphasizing present life, body, comfort, environment, rights, material enjoyment. The most conservative Socialist takes issue with Catholicity there. Gradually we get a less conservative class of Socialists who push the emphasis to the extreme, and the difference is increased. Socialism now may ignore God, soul, sin, responsibility, self-discipline and speak only of its own philosophy as adequate. A step farther we reach direct negation of God, soul, free will, religion, the supernatural. Then Socialism is in a frame of mind for everything. When that moral and spiritual vacuum has been made, atheism, free love, revolution, confusion of standards rush in and all fuse into a total hideous repulsive mass of hate, irreverence, limitless aspiration and discontent.

Possibly Catholics in opposing Socialism pay too much attention to its features which are identified with atheism and free love, and thus miss the deeper spiritual danger contained historically in its simplest form. Brownson, in writing of Socialism as he found it in 1849, said:

"The essence of Socialism is in this very assumption that our good lies in the natural order, and is unattainable by individual effort. Socialism bids us follow nature instead of saying with the Gospel, resist nature. Placing our good in the natural order, it necessarily restricts it to temporal goods, the only good the order of nature can give. For it, then, evil is not remediable, or good attainable, by individual effort. We depend on nature, which may resist us, and on the conduct of others which escapes our control. Hence the necessity of social organization, in order to harmonize the interests of all with the interests of each, and to enable each by the union of all to compel nature to yield him up the good she has in

store for him. But all men are equal before God, and since He is just, He is equal in regard to all. Then all have equal rights—an equal right to exemption from evil and an equal right to the possession of good. Hence the social organization must be such as to avert equal evil from all and to secure to each an equal share of temporal goods. Here is Socialism in a nutshell."⁴

A recent expression from a Socialist representing himself as a Catholic is to the point as indicating accurately the difference between Catholicity and Socialism. He wrote in the *Appeal to Reason*, December 19, 1903, replying to Bishop Matz, who had preached a series of sermons against Socialism: "All men are more the creatures than they are the creators of their circumstances, and therefore the gulf that separates the saint from the sinner, the hero from the common mortal is not so much of individual merit or goodness as it is of circumstances. The evils from which we suffer are due more to the social conditions surrounding the individual than to any inherent wickedness in the individual himself. Individual responsibility there is, to be sure, but it is infinitesimal compared with social responsibility. Any government which vests the people with plenary power, which recognizes the right of self-government, necessarily repudiates the idea that man is born with wicked tendencies. . . . All democratic forms of government, therefore, recognize the inherent power of man to grow, develop and rise in the social scale by a natural process." Really the economic or political theory of Socialism is not its inspiration. To the soldier the flag is not cloth, it is a symbol. So phrases are symbols, not thoughts, to the Socialist. Catholicity has no great concern with Socialism's pure economics, but it has much concern with any attempt to explain life and reconstruct it by excluding the spiritual forces on which its guidance depends.

Catholicity believes that man's heart is chiefly to blame for social wrongs, Socialism blames our institutions, our environment. Catholicity looks on the social question as mainly one of sin, Socialism sees no sin, sees only social questions. The Socialist takes advantage of class hate and appeals to it, Catholicity would extinguish it by the charity of God. Thus Socialism presents an analysis of social questions which includes no element of sin; it proposes a plan of reform which makes no note of grace. Catholicity sees sin omnipresent, and the redeeming power of Christ intended to conquer it. She looks to conscience in her final hope—conscience whose torch is lighted by the hand of God, but in Socialism she hears only of institutions to replace it, and these built on an unspiritualized humanity. Catholicity looks for repentance in the heart,

⁴ Works, Vol. X., p. 95.

contrition on the lips and love in the eyes of all reform, but she finds in Socialism the heart unmoved to feel its guilt, lips speaking only words of spiritual forgetfulness and eyes brilliant only with the hope of present conquest.

Catholicity has seen the ages. The Church has seen sin undermine institutions where repentance alone could have saved them. She has seen sin in the strong and sin in the weak, in the high and in the low. This universal and appalling fact is the key to her philosophy of history, of government, of property, of law, of society. She sees sin deeper than States, domestic with every people, at home in every clime. Her theologians ascribe the origin of property to sin and they would be the first to advocate its abolition did it promise relief. No less a reformer than St. Francis of Assisi said that "from possession arise difficulties and disputes which put obstacles of all kinds to the love of God and neighbor." The Church has seen civilizations decay because of sin and institutions fail because of it and noble purposes die shamefully from its deadly touch. She has seen the paralysis of it creep in among her children, into highest and holiest places, disturbing her noblest work, and carrying ruin and humiliation where the peace and purity of God had dwelt. This great race fact of sin called down Christ in redeeming love and created the need out of which the Church herself arises. It is not strange that the sense of sin and of God's presence and redemption are found everywhere in the Church. And to-day, in a world that is losing the sense of sin and forgetting its prayer for grace and knowledge from above, the Church's penances, fasts and abstinence, her devotions, her prayers, ritual, benedictions, her traditions, discipline, institutions stand with impressive stability, proof of her unvarying realization of the reality of sin and the need of grace in human life. Truly she is the prophet of God in a forgetful age.

The Church does believe, and profoundly believe, in human and divine brotherhood, in charity, in justice and peace, but she looks for them at the end of the process of sanctification, and not at the beginning. She looks for reform after repentance, peace after penance, joy after faith and progress through grace. There is a quaint simplicity but deep penetration in the words which Newman quotes from an old Bishop who said of the hermits: "By their merit the anger of the Supreme Judge is abated, a healthier atmosphere is granted, corn springs up more abundantly, famine and pestilence withdraw, the State is better governed, prisons are opened, the fetters unbound, the shipwrecked relieved."⁵ Then Church would expect material and social progress after spiritual regeneration,

⁵ *Historical Sketches*, II., 411.

while Socialism expects it independently of the soul. The Church understands social life from the standpoint of sin and grace; she believes in the spiritual senses and trusts no reform, accepts no promise and shares no hope for better days unless purified hearts be laid as foundations for our institutions and divinely guided conscience control their functions.

Fr. Cuthbert in his volume on "Catholic Ideals in Social Life" (p. 78) says with much justice:

"The Socialists, in insisting upon the solidarity of society, have become to an increasing number of men the exponents of a deep moral truth. It is a truth which Catholicism has borne evidence throughout the long ages of its history; but the Socialists, by preaching this doctrine with a loud voice and perpetual insistence, have made themselves in popular estimation its proper exponents. In opposing the Socialist propaganda Catholics have perhaps failed to recognize sufficiently this Catholic truth behind the vagaries and errors of Socialist teaching, and thereby seemed to the populace to ignore it. Where the Socialist goes astray in the application of this truth is that he seeks to realize it in practices by legal coercion to the exclusion of the claims of individual conscience; he inordinately deprives the individual of a share in the moral government of his own life, and makes him a mere creature of the State or community. Catholicism, on the other hand, seeks to realize the moral solidarity of the race by making the individual the custodian of the common good, and making him primarily answerable to God, and only in a secondary degree to the State. Thus the Church preserves inviolate the proper liberty of human life. The Socialist would force a man to labor by legal penalties; Catholicism makes his own responsibility depend rather upon his own innate sense of social justice. Not that the Church would altogether disapprove of legal pressure being brought to bear upon the idle to force them to work, only that normally her aim is as far as possible to make a man's conscience, rather than legal coercion, the guide and informant of his moral life; whereas the tendency of Socialism is to supplant conscience by external law."

It is no wonder then that Catholicity shrinks back from Socialism, even in its mildest form because it misunderstands totally her philosophy. In reducing social evils, even social sins and injustice to private ownership of capital, Socialism presents a scene of confusion, error and positive danger that she fears. When she is told by a Catholic Socialist that "the private ownership of the means of production and distribution is the cause of all poverty and the suffering resulting from it, all dishonesty in dealing and all crimes committed for the gain of money or property," she recognizes a confu-

sion which she dreads.⁶ When she is told that socialization of capital will bring back the redemption sought, she cannot believe. However noble the purpose that prompts this remedy and loyal the service that its adherents would render, Catholicity cannot accept it. When she hears that human nature is better than we think, pure and noble always in proper environment, she cannot escape her own conviction that personal moral responsibility has an important rôle, and that only by strong belief in it will it be secured.

The spirit of Catholicity and the spirit of Socialism are antagonistic as both stand historically. Socialism is a philosophy constructed from life experience alone, intended to bring comfort, present peace and entire justice to all men; it is unrelated, generally, to the future, to the soul, to sin. It accounts for social evils and sin by social institutions, and promises remedy through institutions. Catholicity is a philosophy of authority intended to shape, direct, discipline life. It seeks first the Kingdom of God, and the spiritual is its absolute criterion. Soul, sin, self-discipline, personal responsibility, duty are its fundamental thoughts. It looks for social reform through individual moral reform. Socialism looks for individual reform through social reform. Catholicity looks to conscience mainly for its hope of the social order, and Socialism looks to a social order for conscience. Both use some terms in common—justice, fraternity, equality, peace—and hence many are led to believe the two to be identical. They are alike in the sense that a cone is like to its own image reflected, in inverted perspective. Hence proportions are different. The generous impulse of Socialism, its justifiable criticism of conditions which shame us and sadly tell of the failure of religion to conquer the situation, may not be denied. It does appeal to noble men as well as to ignoble, and does contain, as Brownson said, many elements of noble truth.

Limits of space hinder for the present the development of this view of the problem to a point of satisfactory completeness. Suggestion rather than decision was kept in mind throughout. Many secondary questions have been raised, the thorough discussion of which would be necessary in order to reach a final view. Thus, for instance, the actual relation of social institutions to sin, the power of environment over development, the degree to which Socialism's criticism may be true and strong, the elements of truth in its teaching and of justice in its contentions, the degree to which in our own position we may err in emphasis are all pertinent, and a fair attitude to Socialism can scarcely be taken unless we work out these problems thoroughly. Again there is the whole question of the positive policy of the organized Church toward organized Socialism, and

⁶ Open letter from a Catholic to Pope Leo; Brown.

vice versa. When Socialism formally attacks the Church she is certainly justified in self-protection, justified in going beyond the purely spiritual in her defense.

Taking a large view of the situation, it seems that we need a spiritual judgment of Socialism in its mildest, least objectionable form. A line on which such judgment might be based is suggested here. We might then construct the whole line of defense and meet Socialism always with the discrimination that justice demands and the fairness that truth imposes.

Finally, one should not lose from sight the wider application of this principle of spiritual judgment which leads the Church to condemn much in the present social order whose stability she defends against Socialism.

WILLIAM J. KERBY.

Washington, D. C.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE ORIGINAL APOSTLES TO THE FACT OF THE RESURRECTION.

FOR the disciples of our blessed Lord His bodily resurrection was an event of supreme importance and significance. It was the transcendent miracle to which they could triumphantly point to prove to their contemporaries that He was truly the Messiah, the Son of God. Their own faith in the Messianic claims of Jesus had been rudely shaken by His ignominious death on the cross. They had shared the view prevalent in their time that the Messiah would not die, but would live on forever in company with His elect. Jesus had proclaimed Himself the author and giver of life. His unlooked for death seemed to give the lie to these claims. In those first hours of separation from their beloved Master the disciples were overwhelmed with grief and dismay. Their hopes would have been buried with Him in the tomb had they not been reassured by personal contact and communication with the risen Lord. It was the resurrection of Jesus and His reappearance in His glorified state that revived their faith and gave them an adequate conception of the kingdom and of the Messiah. Thus it had a dogmatic as well as an apologetic significance. They were brought to recognize that the kingdom, while begun on earth, would be found in its perfection only in the life to come; that it was through the resurrection that Jesus had entered into His true Messianic glory. His risen life became the pledge and pattern of what their life would be who believed in Him and lived for Him.

Thus the resurrection, while not the sole ground of faith, was for the disciples an all-important one. Without it their faith in the Messianic calling of Jesus would have come to naught. Through it their conception of the Messiah was perfected. To it they could appeal in their preaching as the convincing sign of Jesus' divine mission. Hence the faith they preached was faith in the risen Jesus, reigning gloriously at God's right hand. Devotion to the risen Lord was the great impelling motive of their heroic labors.

Had no explicit record of the empty tomb and of the appearances of the risen Lord to His disciples come down to us, there would still be sufficient historical ground for believing that He truly rose from the dead. We should still have as evidence the firm conviction of the apostles that He was risen; for it cannot be denied that from the very outset they preached Christ not only crucified, but risen from the dead, and proclaimed themselves witnesses of the resurrection. This conviction was the unfailing source of that wonderful zeal and courage that carried them on, in the teeth of bitter persecution, to the glorious accomplishment of their great mission. It was on this faith in the risen Christ that the primitive church was built.

The truth of this important assertion does not rest wholly on the first few chapters of Acts. Many radical critics discredit these opening chapters as largely made up of early mythical lore. But the same aspersion cannot be cast on the epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians, Romans and Galatians. Even the radical critics are constrained to acknowledge them as genuine. Now these epistles offer unquestionable evidence that the bodily resurrection of Christ was an all-important element in the earliest preaching both of St. Paul and of the twelve; that in the minds of all without exception faith in the risen Lord was indispensable.

It was from profound conviction that the apostles thus preached the resurrection of the Lord from the dead. The charge of deliberate fraud on the part of Jesus' disciples has long been abandoned and reprobated by all self-respecting scholars. It is repugnant to the sense of decency to question the sincerity of those souls of fire, exemplifying in their daily conduct their lofty moral teaching, sealing their testimony with the pain of many hardships and persecutions, and in not a few instances with the blood of martyrdom. Now the only satisfactory and adequate explanation of this conviction is that Jesus actually rose from the dead and made Himself known in His glorified state to His disciples.

This conclusion would be warranted even if the apostles had left no circumstantial evidence in support of it. But they have done more than to declare themselves in a general way to be witnesses of the resurrection. They have left on record evidence so varied

and so strong as to leave no reasonable doubt that Christ truly rose from the dead.

We shall not consider in the present article the interesting testimony which St. Paul gives of his personal experience of the risen Lord, but shall confine our attention to that of the original disciples of Jesus. This testimony is found in the four Gospels, in the first chapter of Acts and in I. Corinthians xv., 3-8. For the sake of clearness we shall arrange it under four heads: first, the testimony to the death of Jesus; secondly, to His burial; thirdly, to the empty tomb on the third day; lastly, to the objective appearances of the risen Lord.

I. THE DEATH OF JESUS.

The testimony given by the four evangelists to the death of Christ on the cross is unquestionable. They all tell how He was condemned to death by Pontius Pilate, forced to carry His instrument of torture to the place of execution without the walls, and was there crucified between two thieves. If the stern sense of obedience in the Roman soldiers detailed to carry out the execution could not be relied upon to make sure the death of Jesus, the bitter enmity of the Jewish authorities was a sufficient guarantee. It were idle to question the statement of the four evangelists that He died on the cross. (Mat. xxvii., 50, Mark xv., 37, Luke xxiii., 46, John xix., 30.) The fourth Gospel offers corroborative evidence in a statement which few critics would refuse to accept as genuine Johannine tradition, even those who do not take the Gospel to be the direct work of John. The disciple whom Jesus loved, who was an eye-witness of the crucifixion, solemnly declares that when the soldiers came to break the legs of the crucified so as to hasten their death, they broke the legs of the thieves, but after they were come to Jesus, when they saw that He was already dead, they did not break His legs, but one of the soldiers with a spear opened His side, and immediately there came out blood and water." (John xix., 32-34.) No further proof could be desired that Jesus was really dead.

II. THE BURIAL IN THE TOMB.

All four evangelists relate that Joseph of Arimathaea, a wealthy disciple of Jesus, obtained of Pilate permission to take down the lifeless body of Jesus, and that he laid it nearby in a new tomb, hewn out of the rock. (Mat. xxvii., 57-61, Mark xv., 42-47, Luke xxiii., 50-56, John xix., 38-42.) They also tell of the stone rolled up against the entrance to close it. Matthew and Mark record that this stone was of great size (Mat. xxvii., 60, Mark xvi., 4.)

This substantial agreement of the four evangelists is not shaken by a curious discrepancy between the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel on an incidental detail. According to John xix., 39-40, before the body of Jesus was laid in the tomb it was embalmed according to Jewish custom, being wrapped up in a linen winding sheet with a hundred pounds of myrrh and aloes brought by Nicodemus. The Synoptics seem to know nothing of this. They content themselves with the statement that the body was wrapped in a linen cloth, while Mark and Luke plainly imply that the embalming had not taken place, for they tell how on the morning of the resurrection the women came with spices to the tomb for the purpose of embalming Jesus. (Mark xvi., 1, Luke xxiv., 1, cf. xxiii., 56.) Similar divergencies of detail are to be found scattered through the Gospels. Far from weakening the main testimony, they do but confirm it by showing the absence of anything like collusion on the part of the evangelists. Paley's aphorism applies here: "The usual character of human testimony is substantial truth under circumstantial variety."

Matthew adds to the general evidence an important and interesting detail. After the body of Jesus had been laid in the tomb, the Jewish authorities came to Pilate, "Saying: Sir, we have remembered that that seducer said, while He was yet alive: After three days I will rise again. Command therefore the sepulchre to be guarded until the third day: lest perhaps His disciples come and steal Him away and say to the people, He is risen from the dead: and the last error shall be worse than the first. Pilate said to them: Ye have a guard: go, guard it as you know. And they departing, made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone and setting guards." (Mat. xxviii., 63-66.)

III. THE EMPTY TOMB ON THE THIRD DAY.

The four evangelists likewise agree in asserting that Jesus died the day before the Sabbath, that is, on a Friday, and that His tomb was found empty the morning of the first day of the week, that is, Sunday. In this four-fold story of the empty tomb there is again a considerable variety of detail and some divergence that makes it impossible to combine all into one absolutely consistent account. But the main purport of the story, the discovery of the empty tomb by the women and its verification by one or two of the apostles cannot reasonably be discredited.

According to John, it was Mary Magdalen who first came to the tomb, alone. She found the stone rolled away and the tomb empty. Not knowing what it meant, she ran to Peter and John and told

them in tears that the body of Jesus had been taken away, she knew not where. (John xx., 1-2.)

According to the Synoptics, the tomb was discovered empty, not by Mary Magdalen alone, but by several women together, she being in the number. Mark and Luke say they came with spices to embalm the body, a thing which precludes the notion that Mary was already aware of what had happened at the tomb. To their great surprise, they found the stone rolled back and the tomb empty. While they stood there bewildered, they were informed by an angel (two according to Luke) that Jesus was alive, having risen from the dead. (Mat. xxviii., 1-10, Mark xvi., 1-11, Luke xxiv., 1-12.)

The last two Gospels supplement the testimony of the women with that of St. Peter and St. John. According to Luke, the women were not believed when they told the Apostles what they had seen; but Peter ran to the tomb, and looking in, saw it was empty, only the linen cloths remaining. He went away wondering at that which was come to pass. (Luke xxiv., 10-12.) According to John, when Mary Magdalene came and told Peter and John that the body of Jesus had been taken away, both ran to the tomb and entering found it empty, as Mary had said. They saw the grave cloths lying to one side and apart by itself, the face cloth rolled up. (John xx., 9.)¹

In the testimony thus far reviewed it is important to note that the discovery of the empty tomb was a thing for which none of Jesus' disciples were prepared. It is true their divine Master had told them more than once of His approaching death and resurrection on the third day. But the current idea of the Messiah was that He should not die. This idea the Apostles shared as well, and so Christ's repeated prediction of His death and resurrection was so foreign to their expectations that they did not heed it. In the words of Luke xviii., 34, "They understood none of these things, and this word was hid from them, and they understood not the things that were said." It was only after the event that the meaning of these prophetic utterances dawned upon them. "For as yet

¹ Matthew's statement that the Jewish authorities asked of Pilate a guard for the tomb because of Jesus' prediction that he should rise from the dead on the third day, is not out of harmony with what the evangelists say of the failure of the apostles to keep this prediction in mind. Neither the Jewish authorities nor the apostles expected that the true Messiah would die. Hence, for the very reason that they believed in the Messianic office of Christ, his disciples did not heed his prediction of his death and resurrection. On the other hand, the hostile, unbelieving Jews were eager to catch and retain every saying of Jesus that had, in their judgment, the character of an unwarranted pretention.

they knew not the scripture that He must rise again from the dead." (John xx., 9.)*

As the thought of the resurrection was absent from the minds of the disciples, so, too, they had not the slightest expectation of finding the tomb empty on the third day. This is plainly implied in every one of the Gospel accounts. Had the Apostles looked for such an event, it would have been the one absorbing topic of their conversation. The devout women would have rehearsed it with the disciples. Not one but would have awaited the third day with feverish impatience when they would have hastened to the tomb to see the glorious fulfilment of their expectation. But how differently runs the story! On the resurrection morn the Apostles are absent from the scene, with no thought of the tomb. It is the women, coming with spices to embalm the body who discover to their amazement that the tomb is empty. Even when they announce to the Apostles what they have seen their report is received with incredulity.

It is not the disciples alone who give testimony that on the third day the tomb no longer contained the body of their crucified Master. Among the witnesses to the fact must be included the very enemies of Jesus. Unwelcome as the news was to them, they showed by their conduct that they were forced to recognize its truth. It was a fact they could not deny, though it was to their interest to gainsay it, if denial were possible. Their witness to the empty tomb is thus particularly impressive.

That they recognized the tomb to be empty is shown by their collusion with the guards, recorded by Matthew xxviii., 11-15. These guards, while in the very act of watching the tomb, had seen the angel roll back the stone, and on recovering from their fear had found the tomb empty. Thereupon they reported to the chief priests what had happened. "And they being assembled together with the ancients, taking counsel, gave a great sum of money to the soldiers, saying: Say you, His disciples came by night and stole Him away while we were asleep. And if the governor shall hear of this we will persuade him and secure you." By this ignoble conduct the Jewish authorities betrayed their embarrassment at an event which could not be ignored. Unable to deny the fact of the empty tomb, they sought to make current a false explanation.

Another proof that the enemies of Jesus recognized the tomb to be empty is to be found in their inability to refute the Apostles when they began on the day of Pentecost to proclaim in the very streets of Jerusalem that Jesus was risen from the dead. Had the tomb contained the body of Jesus there was at hand an easy, summary way of silencing the Apostles and of putting them to lasting

shame in the eyes of the people. This was to have the tomb opened and the body brought to view. The authorities did not take this simple means because it was not in their power. The tomb was empty.

IV. THE OBJECTIVE APPEARANCES OF THE RISEN LORD.

The empty tomb offers valuable indirect evidence in support of the apostolic preaching that Christ truly rose from the dead. But more important still is the direct evidence based on the experience of those who saw the risen Lord, conversed with Him and even touched Him. This evidence is to be found chiefly in the Gospels. St. Paul, in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, enumerates it in a brief but important passage, of which we shall take account after we have reviewed the testimony recorded in the Gospels.

Numerous manifestations of the risen Lord are related in the Gospels, especially in the last two. The appearances recorded in Mark xvi., 9 ff., valuable as they may be on other grounds, are of little apologetic weight. It is the judgment of most non-Catholic critics and of some Catholic scholars like Fr. Rose, O. P., that these verses are a later addition to the original text. For this reason we shall confine our attention to the accounts in Matthew, Luke and John. Without attempting to harmonize the divergences of detail in the three evangelists, we shall enumerate the appearances as far as possible in chronological order.

1. The risen Lord appeared to the devout women near the tomb and spoke to them. They took hold of His feet and adored Him. (Mat. xxviii., 9-10.)

2. He appeared and spoke to Mary Magdalene, but would not let her touch Him. (John xx., 11-18.)²

3. He appeared to the two disciples, conversed with them and walked with them as far as Emmaus. While eating with them He vanished before their eyes. (Luke xxiv., 13-32.)

4. He appeared to Simon Peter. (Luke xiv., 33-34.)

5. He appeared to the assembled Apostles in the upper room, and to assure them that He was not a disembodied spirit, showed them His hands and feet, bade them touch Him, and ate before them. (Luke xxiv., 36-43, John xx., 19-20.)

The appearances thus far mentioned are recorded to have taken place on the very day of the resurrection.

6. He appeared to the assembled Apostles a week later and convinced the skeptical Thomas that He was truly risen by showing him His wounded hands and feet and side. (John xx., 24-29.)

² These two accounts, widely divergent though they be, may refer to one and the same experience.

7. He appeared to His disciples at the Sea of Galilee and ate and conversed with them. (John xx., 1-23.)

8. He appeared to the Apostles on a hill in Galilee. (Mat. xxviii., 16-20.)

9. He appeared to His disciples on Mount Olivet, whence He ascended to heaven. (Luke xxiv., 50-51, Acts i., 6-12.)

This imposing array of testimony has little weight with the skeptical critic of to-day. Besides suggesting that the disciples were innocent victims of hallucination, he seeks to discredit the genuineness of most of the testimony by relegating it to the rubbish heap of pious myth and legend. His eye is keen to note the discrepancies in the respective accounts which the four evangelists give of the visions. He bids us observe that the experience of Mary Magdalene and the other women at the tomb, as recorded by the first three evangelists, is absolutely inconsistent with the account in John of Mary's vision of the risen Lord. He notes that while the majority of the visions, related only by Luke and John, are said to have happened to the disciples in and about Jerusalem shortly after the resurrection—all others being excluded by Luke's alleged command of the risen Lord to His disciples: "But stay you in the city till you be indued with power from on high" (xxiv., 49)—Matthew and Mark, who represent the simpler, earlier tradition, know nothing of these Judæan visions and unconsciously bear witness against them; for their recorded message of the angel on the resurrection morn can have but one meaning, namely, that the Apostles did not see the risen Lord till after their return to the appointed meeting place in distant Galilee. "And going quickly, tell ye His disciples that He is risen; and behold He will go before you into Galilee; there you shall see Him. Lo, I have foretold it to you." (Mat. xxviii., 7, cf. xxvi., 32, also Mark xvi., 7, and xiv., 28.)

With the testimony in Luke and John thus reduced to mere fungous growths on the simpler tradition of the first two Gospels, the critic calmly disposes of the Galilean vision as an hallucination. But the testimony presented by the evangelists cannot thus lightly be set aside. Notwithstanding the difficulty, one might say the impossibility, of bringing into complete harmony the divergent accounts of the visions, one is not thereby justified in passing on all alike a sweeping condemnation. The same process of reasoning might be used with equal propriety to discredit the story of the crucifixion. Nor is it fair to set up the meagre account of the first two evangelists as if it contained all that was known in their day of the appearances of the risen Lord, and treat the ampler accounts in Luke and John as later, legendary developments.

In proof of this we have but to turn to the first Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, the genuineness of which cannot be questioned. In the fifteenth chapter, verses three to eight, we find a written record of appearances of the risen Lord that antedates all of the Gospels and that vouches in a striking way for the truth of the Judæan visions related by Luke and John. We read: "For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received: How that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that He was buried, and that He rose again the third day according to the scriptures; and that He was seen by Cephas; and after that by the eleven.³ Then He was seen by more than five hundred brethren at once, of whom many remain until this present, and some are fallen asleep. After that He was seen by James, then by all the Apostles. And last of all He was seen also by me, as by one born out of due time."

Leaving aside for the time being his own personal testimony, we find St. Paul declaring that the risen Lord appeared at least five times to His disciples; first to Cephas, then to the eleven, then to a group of five hundred disciples, then to James, then again to the assembled Apostles. The manner in which St. Paul enumerates these visions, using the time connectives *then*, *last of all*, seems to show that he had in mind a chronological arrangement. Hence the first two appearances mentioned, that to Cephas and that to the eleven, are in all probability identical with those mentioned by Luke and John as having occurred the day of the resurrection. It is not unlikely that the appearances to the five hundred disciples and to the apostolic group correspond with the Galilean visions, of which at least one is referred to in Matthew and Mark. The localizing of the visions is of minor importance. The chief thing to be noted is that St. Paul agrees with the evangelists in asserting that the disciples on several occasions saw the risen Lord.

The competency of St. Paul to speak with certitude of these wonderful experiences of the Apostles cannot be called in question. He had every opportunity to get his information first-hand. He tells us in his Epistle to the Galatians that on one occasion he spent fifteen days with Cephas and James in Jerusalem; that later on he again visited the holy city and conferred with the Apostles, especially with James and Cephas and John, to make sure that he was preaching the same Gospel as they. (Cf. i., 18-19, ii., 1-2, 9.) It is incredible that in these conferences the story of the resurrection should not have been rehearsed. He must have received from the Apostles themselves the accounts of the visions which he briefly ascribes to

³ In the Greek text, "the twelve," a current designation of the apostolic band, unaffected by the lapse of Judas.

them. In addition, he records the notable appearance of Christ to more than five hundred brethren at one time, of whom the greater part were still alive when he wrote. One could hardly look for statements more positive and assuring. Through St. Paul we are introduced into the very presence of those who saw the risen Lord.

There is thus every reason to acknowledge the genuineness of the testimony of the original Apostles that they saw and conversed with the risen Lord. Are they thoroughly reliable witnesses?

If the only voucher for the appearance of Jesus in His glorified state were the testimony of the devout women mentioned in the Gospel story, one might be excused for doubting. Women in whom an emotional temperament is combined with a strong religious turn of mind have more than once been the victims of pious hallucination. And so, taken by itself, the testimony of the women that they saw the risen Lord would not be of much worth. But the same cannot be said of the testimony of the Apostles. They were, most of them, plain, prosaic, matter-of-fact men, taken from humble walks of life, trained by daily toil to be anything but dreamers.

Where subjective visions occur they presuppose a process of intense brooding on some favorite object of desire. Hence in whatever form the vision theory is set forth, it is assumed that the Apostles were in a state of great mental tension due to the persuasion that their crucified Lord could not be under the lasting dominion of death and to the corresponding expectation that He must rise again. This assumption is, as we have seen, in flat contradiction with the evidence. The Apostles were not looking for Christ's rising from the dead. They were amazed when told of the empty tomb. They received with cold skepticism the announcement of the women that Jesus was risen. Only when they saw Him themselves were they convinced.

Moreover, they saw the risen Lord under too great a variety of conditions and circumstances to leave any room for doubt. Jesus did not merely show Himself on one sole occasion. Nor did He simply appear at a distance like a spectre, and then vanish forever. The Apostles were convinced not only that they saw Him and heard Him, but that they touched Him, ate with Him, conversed with Him and thereby acquired a larger and truer conception of the kingdom and of their mission. It was not merely in the upper chamber, hallowed by the reminiscences of the Last Supper, that they had these experiences. It was in the little home at Emmaus, under the open sky of Galilee, on Mount Olivet. Now it was to Peter, now to James, now to the two disciples at Emmaus, now to the assembled Apostles lacking Thomas, now to all without excep-

tion, now to the seven at the Sea of Galilee, now to more than five hundred at one time.

It is hard to see how more convincing evidence could be offered to prove an event cognizable to the senses. Shall we, then, reject their testimony as purely fanciful because it implies a stupendous miracle? Can we logically admit the soberness of their judgment when it is question of the empty tomb, and deny the reality of their attested visions of the risen Christ, by which alone the empty tomb is explained? By evading the fact of the resurrection does not the critic land himself in a still greater difficulty, to account for the marvelous growth and influence of the Church of Christ on the basis of idle dreams?

CHARLES F. AIKEN, S. T. D.

Washington, D. C.

THE NEWLY DISCOVERED "SAYINGS OF JESUS."

IT IS now seven years ago, for it happened in 1897, that Dr. Grenfell and Dr. Hunt found a first papyrus containing eight "Sayings of Jesus." The two archæologists were engaged in researches in Egypt under the direction of the Egypt Exploration Fund. About 120 miles south of Cairo, on the edge of the Libyan desert, a series of low mounds covered with Roman and early Arab pottery marks the site of the ancient capital of the Oxyrhynchus district. The wide area and the size of its ruins show the past grandeur and importance of the place. But Arab rule has reduced the populous city to a mere hamlet called Behnesa. In recent times it became known that Behnesa contains more than the scattered ruins of the Roman and early Christian Oxyrhynchus. Hunters of ancient Greek papyri discover in Egyptian Behnesa as many treasures as the seekers after gold find in the Arctic regions of Alaska. No wonder that diggers as experienced as Dr. Grenfell and Dr. Hunt should find their way to the ruined city in order to turn the sandhills of the Libyan desert into eloquent witnesses for historical and doctrinal antiquity.

Their first three weeks of work were devoted to the ancient cemetery and proved fruitless. But the rubbish heaps of the town furnished large quantities of papyri, mainly Greek, ranging from the first to the eighth century and embracing every variety of subject. Probably Arsinoë is the only site of antiquity that has been more fertile in this respect. The most valuable among the finds was, no doubt, a leaf from a papyrus book, containing eight *Logia* or "Sayings of Jesus." The fragment was found in a mound which pro-

duced a great number of papyri belonging to the first three centuries of our era. The handwriting, too, was so characteristically Roman that it cannot be dated later than 300 A. D. On the other hand, the book form of the papyrus and the contractions it exhibits do not allow it to be placed in the first century. Its discoverers, therefore, have assigned it to the period 150-300 A. D. At the same time, the uncials of the fragment are far from exhibiting the latest type used before 300 A. D. It cannot be very wrong, therefore, to fix on the years about 200 A. D. as the most probable date of the manuscript.

In size the leaf measures $5\frac{3}{4} \times 3\frac{3}{4}$ inches, though its broken lower end shows that the original height must have been somewhat greater. Several indications point to the inference that the leaf was so placed in its codex as to make its *verso* side come uppermost. The discoverers published and interpreted their find in the year 1897,¹ and before the end of the year 1898 quite a number of articles and monographs had dealt with the same subject.² The results of these investigations were: First, a reliable interpretation of the text; secondly, a clear outline of its relation to other remnants of early Christian literature.

Logion I. “. . . and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote that is in thy brother's eye.”³

The reader will notice that the Saying agrees with Luke vi., 42, while it slightly differs from Matthew vii., 5. If the *verso* side of the leaf came first in the book, as it seems to have done, the whole text as found in St. Luke and St. Matthew may have preceded. If the *recto* side came first, the text of the evangelists must have appeared in an abbreviated form, since the lost lower margin could not hold the full text. The first Saying occupies line 1-4 of the fragment.

Logion II. “Jesus saith, Except ye fast to the world, ye shall in no wise find the kingdom of God; and except ye keep the Sabbath, ye shall not see the Father.”⁴

¹ Grenfell and Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Part I; in separate form, *ΑΓΙΑ ΙΗΣΟΥ : Sayings of Our Lord*, London, 1897, Egypt Exploration Fund.

² Lock and Sanday, *Two Lectures on the Sayings of Jesus*, Oxford, 1897, Clarendon Press; Swete, *The Oxyrhynchus Fragment*, in *Expository Times* for September, 1897; Harnack, *Ueber die jüngst entdeckten Sprüche Jesu*, transl. in *Expositor* for Nov. and Dec., 1897; Zahn, *Die jüngst gefundenen Aussprüche Jesu*, in the *Theol. Literaturblatt* for Sept. 3 and 10, 1897; James, *The New Sayings of Christ*, and Rendel Harris, *The Logia and the Gospels*, in the *Contemporary Review* for Aug. and Sept., 1897; P. Batiffol, *Les Logia du Papyrus de Behnesa*, in the *Revue Biblique* for Oct., 1897; Abbott, *The Logia of Behnesa*, in the *American Journal of Theology* for Jan., 1898.

³ . . . καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις ἐκβαλεῖν τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου.

⁴ Ἀλέγει Ἰησοῦς, εἰὰν νηστεύσῃτε τὸν κόσμον οὐ μὴ εὕρητε τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ. καὶ εἰὰν μὴ σαββατίσῃτε τὸ σάββατον οὐκ ὄψεσθε τὸν πατέρα.

In the first *Logion* we recognized a coincidence with the synoptic tradition; this second Saying is wholly new as far as its contents are concerned. The language is not so far removed from the phraseology of the Gospels as it seems to be at first sight. The conditional form in which the requisits for salvation are expressed reminds one of several passages in the Synoptic Gospels.⁵ The phrase "kingdom of God" is too well known to the student of the Synoptists to need special mention. The expression "to find the kingdom" runs parallel to the formula "to seek the kingdom," which occurs in St. Matthew and St. Luke.⁶ Finally, Harnack believes that the expression "to see the Father" reminds one rather of the Fourth Gospel⁷ than either of the third or the first.⁸

What strikes one as peculiar in the second *Logion* is the metaphorical meaning of the two expressions, "to fast to the world" and "to keep the Sabbath." The former expression implies a renunciation of the world, the second a sanctification of the inner man; the former contains a negative element, the latter adds a positive duty. It is true that Luke xiv., 33, expresses the negative element with sufficient clearness; but the expression "the world" has a Johannine flavor,⁹ and the clear opposition between "the world" and "the kingdom" is first met with in "the Shepherd" of Hermas.¹⁰ The phrase "to fast to the world" does not occur in early Christian literature in the meaning it has in the second *Logion*. The metaphorical meaning of "Sabbath" may be traced back to Hebrews iv., 9; it finds its fuller development in the writings of Barnabas¹¹ and Justin Martyr.¹² And what shall we say after all this with regard to the genuineness of the *Logion*? The ideas it expresses are in agreement with the teaching of Christ, but its form has no accurate parallel in the accredited sources of Christ's spoken words.

Logion III. "Jesus saith, I stood in the midst of the world, and in the flesh was I seen of them, and I found all men drunken, and none found I athirst among them, and my soul grieveth over the sons of men, because they are blind in their heart [and they see not their] poverty."¹³

⁵ Cf. Matthew xvi., 26; xviii., 3; Mark viii., 36; x., 15; Luke xvii., 33; xviii., 17.

⁶ Matthew vi., 33; Luke xii., 31.

⁷ John xiv., 9.

⁸ Cf. Matthew xi., 25-27.

⁹ Cf. I. John ii., 15.

¹⁰ Sim. i.; cf. II. Clem. vi., 3 ff. and Pistis Sophia, Schwartz, p. 158.

¹¹ C. 15.

¹² Dial. 12; cf. 19, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27.

¹³ Λέγει Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ ἐν σαρκὶ ὤφθη αὐτοῖς, καὶ εἶδον πάντας μεθύοντας καὶ οὐδένα εἶδον διψῶντα ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ πονεῖ ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἐπὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὅτι τυφλοὶ εἰσιν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν καὶ οὐ βλέπουσιν εἰς τὴν πτωχείαν.

The ending of this Saying is somewhat uncertain, since it is quite illegible in the Greek fragment. Dr. Grenfell and Dr. Hunt assume that a whole line has been lost after the expression "their heart"—this line would have been the last on page 1 of the papyrus—and that a new *Logion* began with the lost line and ended with the word "poverty" in line 1 on page 2 of the papyrus. Harnack is of opinion that the space is too short for a new *Logion*. He does not admit the loss of a line, but advances the above conjectural supplement, "and they see not their poverty."

The aorists found in the introductory part of the *Logion*, "I stood," etc., suggest the hypothesis that the words were spoken by Jesus after His Resurrection. Such post-Resurrection speeches of the Lord are not uncommon in the apocryphal Gospels. But the present tense in the clause "my soul grieveth" supposes Jesus still in His mortal flesh. The Saying points, therefore, to a late period in Christ's public life. The thought expressed in the introductory clauses is parallel with Pauline and Johannine ideas.¹⁴ Jesus speaks here as a divine being, reminding one of the prophetic words in Bar. iii., 38. In this respect the third *Logion* puts more explicit professions of His Divinity in the mouth of our Lord than does the Fourth Gospel.

The body of the Saying contains two main statements: First, men are lacking in susceptibility; secondly, Jesus Himself undergoes painful labor for their spiritual interest. The expression "drunken" may be compared with Matthew xxiv., 49; it has several parallels in the Old Testament. The absolute use of the verb rendered "athirst" occurs also in the Fourth Gospel,¹⁵ but has no parallel in the Sermon on the Mount. The general expressions "all" and "none" must be understood as rhetorical conceits, after the manner of Matthew xiii., 37. The phrase "my soul grieveth" may have its origin in Is. liii., 10, though complaints about the blindness and unresponsiveness of men occur repeatedly in the Gospels.¹⁶ These latter also testify repeatedly to the sorrow Jesus felt over the fruitlessness of His work.¹⁷ The preposition which occurs in the Greek text after the verb "grieveth" has its parallel in Mark iii., 5, and the phrase "the sons of men" also reminds one of Mark iii., 28. Both preposition and phrase indicate the hebraizing tendency of the *Logion*. The same may be said of the verb "to find," which occurs twice in the present Saying and once in both the second and the fourth.

¹⁴ Cf. I. Timothy iii., 16; John i., 10, 11, 14.

¹⁵ John vi., 35; vii., 37; xiv., 13-15.

¹⁶ Cf. Matthew xv., 14 f.; xxiii., 16-26; John ix., 39 ff.

¹⁷ Matthew xxiii., 37; xxvi., 38; Mark xiv., 34; Luke xix., 41; John xii., 27; cf. Act. Petr., Vercell. 10; Iren. I. xx., 2.

Considering the different parts of the *Logion* connectedly, we perceive that it unites the so-called Johannine and Pauline theology with the synoptic tradition, and this in such a way as to stand nearer to the synoptic tradition than does the Fourth Gospel. Harnack is of opinion that the early synoptic tradition developed in a dual course; one of these became the source of the Gospel according to St. John; the other of the Gospel from which the present *Logion* was taken.

Logion IV. "Jesus saith, wherever there are [two], they are not without God, and wherever there is one alone, I say, I am with him. Raise the stone, and there thou shalt find me; cleave the wood, and there am I."¹⁸

This *Logion* presents two main difficulties; its beginning is mutilated and its meaning is obscure. It would lead us too far in a paper like the present to enter upon an investigation of the true original text. In our note we give the restoration of the Saying that has found favor in the eyes of most scholars; we need not say that the brackets in the Greek text indicate the portion restored by the editors of the *Logion*. But there is no such practical unanimity as to the meaning of the Saying. Bacon refers it to the ritual sacrifice: "Prepare an altar, pile up the stone, cleave the wood for fire, and I shall be there in your worship." Abbott and Schmiedel see in the "raising of stones" a reference to the children of Israel, and in the "cleaving of wood" they find a reminder of the barren tree of Pharisaic observance. James explains, "you must make an effort if you wish to find me."¹⁹

Barnes sees in the "stone" an allegory of the sepulchre, and in the "wood" a figure of the cross. Swete, too, has recourse to an allegory, "Christ is with the disciple who is a builder of Christianity." Even pantheistic and animistic explanations have been suggested, finding in the Saying evidence of God's or the soul's immanence in nature. The patrons of this latter opinion compare the Saying with an extract from the Gnostic "Gospel of Eve" as quoted by Epiphanius²⁰ or with certain expressions of the "Pistis Sophia."²¹ Even the writings of St. Paul are laid under contribution in order to show the ubiquitous presence of Jesus.²²

Leaving aside these extravagant views, we believe that Harnack, Lock, and Sanday have suggested a meaning which is substantially correct. The *Logion* insists on the fact that Christ will be with His

¹⁸ [Ἀ]γίαι [Ἰησοῦς, ὅπ]ου ἂν ᾖσιν [β οὐκ] ε[ἰ]σι]ν ἄθροι, καὶ [ὁ]που ε[ἰ]ς] ἑστιν ὁ μόνος, [ἀ]γίω, ἐγὼ εἰμι μετ' αὐτ[ῶν]. ἔγει[ρ]ον τὸν λίθον καὶ ἐνρήσεις με, σχίσον τὸ ξύλον καὶ ἐκεῖ εἰμι.

¹⁹ Cf. Matthew vii., 7.

²⁰ Haer. xxvi., 3.

²¹ P. 145: ego sum isti, et isti sunt ego.

²² Pph. iv., 6.

disciples everywhere, even in their daily toil. The second half of the Saying gives the concrete application of the general principle laid down in the first. We have here a parallel of Matthew xviii., 20, "where two or three are gathered together," etc.;²³ a still closer parallel is found in Tatian's "Diatessaron"²⁴ and in the passages alleged in Resch's "Paralleltexte zu Matthäus."²⁵

The reader will, no doubt, be struck by the antithesis between our *Logion* and the words of Ecclesiastes;²⁶ "He that removeth stones, shall be hurt by them; and he that cutteth trees, shall be wounded by them." The student of the "Preacher" easily understands that this antithesis does not imply a contradiction between the inspired teaching of the Old Testament and that of the New. At the same time, it must be granted that the author of the *Logion*, whoever he be, implicitly refers to Ecclesiastes, though he gives a Greek rendering of the Hebrew text that differs from the Septuagint version. Finally, the clauses "they are not without God" and "I am with him" are evidently intended as parallels, so that Jesus is here again represented not only as God, but also as proclaiming His Divinity.

Logion V. "Jesus saith, A prophet is not acceptable in his own country, neither doth a physician work cures upon them that know him."²⁷

The first half of the Saying is literally in agreement with Luke iv., 24, excepting the clause "a prophet is not," for which the evangelist reads "no prophet is." But Matthew xiii., 57, too, reads "a prophet is not," though he substitutes "without honor, save" instead of the word of the *Logion* "acceptable." Moreover, the first evangelist adds "and in his own house," while Mark vi., 4, presents the further addition "and among his own kindred." John iv., 44, simply says, "a prophet hath no honor in his own country." The second half of the Saying is new, but may be compared with Mark iv., 5: "And he could not do any mighty work there, only that he cured a few that were sick, laying his hands upon them," and also with the clause in Luke iv., 23, "physician, heal thyself." The phrase "they that know him" does not occur in the Gospels. On the whole, the sentiment expressed in the *Logion* is a sad one, and may be compared with *Logion* III. and with John i., 11, "he came unto his own, and his own received him not." No one will deny that Jesus may have uttered the thoughts contained in the Saying, seeing that it

²³ Cf. Matthew x., 29; John xiv., 23; viii., 29; xvi., 32.

²⁴ Zahn, p. 169: "ubi unus est, ibi et ego sum."

²⁵ P. 233 f.

²⁶ x., 9.

²⁷ Λέγει Ἰησοῦς, οὐκ ἔστιν δεκτὸς προφήτης ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτ[ο]ῦ, οὐδὲ ἰατρός ποιεῖ θεραπείας εἰς τοὺς γινώσκοντας αὐτόν.

harmonizes so closely with the Gospels, especially with that of St. Luke.

Logion VI. "Jesus saith, A city built upon the top of a high hill, and stablished can neither fall nor be hid."²⁸

Matthew v., 14, offers a parallel to this *Logion* in the words "a city seated on a mountain cannot be hid." It is true that we notice here two discrepancies between the evangelist and the text of the fragment: "seated" instead of "built" and "on a mountain" instead of "upon the top of a high hill." But the first of these discrepancies is covered by the reading of Tatian's "Diatessaron"²⁹ and the Syriac version of Matthew.³⁰ The second may be compared with a passage in the Clementine Homilies.³¹ The additional matter in the Saying reminds one of the parable of the house built upon a rock,³² only there is no reference to the rock, which is the essential point of the parable.

Logion VII. "Jesus saith, Thou hearest with one ear [but the other thou hast closed]."³³

The editors of the fragment as well as its investigators agree that it offers here a Saying which has no parallel in the Gospels. The latter contain no *dictum* of our Lord beginning with the phrase "thou hearest." And what is more, scholars are far from being agreed as to the reading of the original Greek text of the Saying.³⁴

After considering the *Logia* singly, Professor Harnack derives certain inferences from the data presented. (1) The fragment is no remnant of a Gospel from which our first and third Gospels are derived. For the Sayings, especially the third *Logion*, show too much of the Johannine character to be the prototype of the Synoptic Gospels. (2) The fragment is no part of Papias' *Logia* collection. His exegetical work is concerned with the Gospels, and it is only in the explanation of *gospel-dicta* that Papias introduces here and there Sayings of Christ derived from oral or written tradition. (3) The fragment is no extract from or part of a Gnostic Gospel. There is no trace in the *Logia* of Gnostic Dualism, or Doketism, or Pantheism; the emphasis laid on Christ's Divinity cannot be considered an unmistakable sign of Gnosticism. (4) The fragment is not a mere leaf torn out of an ancient Gospel, but it is a designedly

²⁸ Δέγει Ἰησοῦς, πόλις ἡκοδομημένη ἐπ' ἄκρον [ὁ]ρου ἐψηλαῦ καὶ ἐστηρικμένη οὔτε πε[σ]εῖν δύναται οὔτε κρυ[β]ῆναι.

²⁹ Edit. Clasca, p. 15a, Arab.

³⁰ Non potest civitas abscondi supra montem ædificata.

³¹ III. 67; cf. Resch, Paralleltexte zu Matth., p. 68 f.

³² Matthew vii., 24-25.

³³ Δέγει Ἰησοῦς, ἀκούεις [ε]ἰς τὸ ἐν ὠτίον σου, τὸ [δὲ] ἕτερον συνέκλεισας].

³⁴ We need not remind the reader that Dr. Grenfell and Dr. Hunt count eight *Logia* instead of seven. They divide our third Saying into two, so that from the fourth *Logion* their number is one in advance of ours.

prepared excerpt. This is shown by the disconnected character of the single Sayings and by the repetition of the introductory phrase "Jesus saith" before every *Logion*. Moreover, such solemn repetitions would not be found in a document intended for private use only. It must be added, however, that the Oxyrhynchus fragment does not seem to be the autograph of the excerpt. (5) It is certain that the excerpt has not been prepared from the canonical Gospels; though it is possible that the *Logia* are taken from different documents, it is most probable that they were chosen from one work resembling the synoptic tradition in its general character. Again, keeping in mind that this work is not Gnostic in its tendencies; that it resembles the canonical Gospels, and that the papyrus belongs to Egypt, being written early in the third century from a copy whose autograph dates back to the middle of the second century or to a period when the canonical Gospels had not yet reached their preëminent position, we must conclude that the *Logia* were excerpted either from the Gospel of Peter or the Gospel according to the Egyptians. And comparing the reasons for the former theory with those favoring the latter, it will be granted that the papyrus most probably exhibits excerpts from the Gospel according to the Egyptians.

The eight or rather seven Sayings thus far discussed were discovered by Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt seven years ago. The learned archæologists might have discovered a second series of Sayings the very next season had they returned to Oxyrhynchus. But instead they spent some years in excavations at another locality, the Fayûm. Hence it was only in February, 1903, that they came upon another papyrus fragment of an additional five Sayings of Jesus, preceded by an important introduction. Only during the past summer has the public been favored with an official reproduction of the newly discovered Sayings and a discussion of their significance.³⁵ The introductory verse and the five Sayings constituting the second series of *Logia* are written on the back of a single papyrus fragment, the front of which contains a surveyor's record. This latter has been subjected to paleographical tests, and has been found to belong to about 250 A. D. It is, therefore, quite legitimate to infer that the copy of the Sayings belongs to the second half of the third century.

³⁵ Grenfell and Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Part IV., London, 1904, *The Egypt Exploration Fund*; Grenfell and Hunt, *New Sayings of Jesus, and Fragments of a Lost Gospel*, New York, 1904, Oxford University Press; Prof. Swete, *The New Oxyrhynchus Sayings*, in *Expository Times* for August, 1904, p. 488 ff.; Anonym., *Church Quarterly Review* for July, 1904; Heinricl, review of the editio princeps in *Theol. Literaturzeitung* for July 23, 1904; Mgr. Batiffol, in *Revue Biblique* for October, 1904.

The fragment containing the second series of *Logia* differs considerably from that containing the first. The first series was part of a papyrus book, the second is written on a papyrus roll. The text of the first series is on the whole fairly well preserved; the fragment containing the second series of Sayings has been cracked irregularly along the middle of the written page, so that the right half of each column is gone, taking with it about one-half of the text of each line. The left half of the lines is well preserved except at the bottom of the fragment, where the fifth Saying stands. The restoration of the broken lines is in several cases quite clear; in others it is wholly conjectural, so that different scholars will no doubt suggest different readings. Keeping in mind that the fragment contains forty-two lines, one easily sees that the difference between the various restorations is considerable. Only about four or five lines can be restored with some degree of confidence. We may infer from their length that each line must have averaged twenty-nine or thirty letters, or twelve syllables. This is the normal length of an iambic trimeter, one of the measures which professional scribes followed in dividing their matter into *stichi*.³⁶ Here the interpreter has a probable guidance for the restoration of the lines; for no line should considerably exceed twelve syllables or thirty letters. But even supposing that such words have been chosen as will supply the required number of letters and syllables, it is by no means certain that they are the right words. It is true that the surviving portions of each line suggest a certain interpretation, and such suggestions are the more valuable when they happen to coincide with known passages from early Christian sources. The papyrus was written about 250 A. D.; but it cannot be considered the autograph of the Sayings. According to the editors of the *Logia* the year 140 A. D. is the latest date to which the composition of the Sayings can be referred. The period between 100 and 140 A. D. is, therefore, the most probable time of their origin.

Introduction. "These are the [wonderful or true] Sayings which Jesus living [Lord, or who liveth and was dead] spake to [Judas] and Thomas, and he said unto [them, Every one that hearkens] to these words, shall in nowise taste [death]."³⁷

The Greek text of the introduction presents peculiar difficulties to the interpreter. The very opening words are a puzzle that has not as yet been fully solved. The editors supply the epithet "wonderful" after the word "Sayings;" but Professor Swete and Mgr.

³⁶ Cf. Dr. Rendel Harris, *Stichometry*, p. 15 ff.

³⁷ Οἱ τοιοῦτοι οἱ λόγοι οἱ [ἀληθινοὶ οὗτοι ἐλά]λησεν Ἰησοῦς ὁ ζῶν κ[αὶ ἀποθανὼν Ἰουδᾷ τῷ] καὶ Θωμᾷ. καὶ εἶπεν [αὐτῷ ὁ κύριος Ὅστις] ἂν ἴδῃ λόγον τούτ[ων ἀκούσῃ, θανάτου] οὐ μὴ γεύσῃται.

Batiffol prefer the adjective "true." Again, after the participle "living" the noun "Lord" is supplied by the editors. But they avow that this restoration is rather doubtful. Professor Swete calls this combination "unusual, if not unprecedented," preferring the reading "who liveth and was dead," as suggested by more than one passage of the New Testament. Mgr. Batiffol is inclined to supply the adverb "secretly," seeing that the context suggests a private address of the Lord to the Apostles (Judas and) Thomas. The lacuna before "Thomas" may be filled in two different ways. Professor Lake reads "Judas Thomas," and his reading has been adopted by Professor Swete. This combination occurs in the Curetonian Syriac of John xiv., 22, in the "Acts of Thomas,"³⁸ and in the Syriac document quoted in a Greek translation by Eusebius.³⁹ Mgr. Batiffol believes the name of an apostle different from Thomas may be supplied, and he adds that Philip and Matthias usually accompany Thomas. Since Jesus has been styled "the living," it is natural that we should find a principle of life in what follows. It appears to be agreed on all sides that this principle is an adaptation of John viii., 51. The compiler of the Sayings must, therefore, have been quite well acquainted with the Johannine writings.

Logion I. "Jesus saith, Let not him who seeks [the Father] cease until he find [him]; and when he finds he shall be astonished; and being astonished he shall reign, and reigning shall rest."⁴⁰

At the beginning of the Saying the editors supply the phrase "Jesus saith." The vacant space is satisfied with this restoration, and the analogy of the following *Logia* demands it. The substance of the Saying is familiar to the student through its use by Clement of Alexandria.⁴¹ He first cites the second half of the Saying from the Gospel according to the Hebrews; but a second time he gives the whole Saying. Even here he leaves the verb "seeks" without its object, so that his wording reminds one of Matthew vii., 7. The papyrus exhibits a vacancy that cannot be filled by the Greek equivalent of the English word "until;" hence the editors suggest the insertion of the noun "life." Professor Swete prefers the insertion of either "God" or "the Father," while Mgr. Batiffol supplies only the pronoun "me," thus furnishing us a parallel of John vii., 34, "you shall seek me, and shall not find me." According to Professor Swete the exigencies of the vacant space in the next line require the imperative "let him be astonished" rather than the future "he shall be astonished." The imperative also agrees more perfectly with

³⁸ 11; cf. Burkitt, *Journal of Theological Studies*, p. 280 ff.

³⁹ *Hist. Eccl.* i., 13.

⁴⁰ [Λέγει Ἰησοῦς.] μὴ παυσάσθω ὁ ζητῶν . . . ἕως ἂν εὕρῃ καὶ ὅταν εὕρῃ [θαμβηθήσεται καὶ θαμ]βηθεὶς βασιλεύσει καὶ βασιλεύσας ἀναπαύσεται.

⁴¹ *Strom.* II., ix., 45; V. iv., 97.

the foregoing phrase "let not him . . . cease." In the light of the New Testament⁴² the astonishment here mentioned indicates the rush of mingled fear and joy which will follow the great find of life, the discovery of God.

Logion II. "Jesus saith, [Ye ask, who are those] that draw us [to the kingdom, if] the kingdom is in heaven? [They that are on earth, and] the birds of the heaven, [and all beasts] that are under the earth [or upon the earth, and] the fishes of the sea, [these are they which draw] you; and the kingdom [of heaven] is within you, [and whoever shall] know [himself] shall find it. [For if you shall truly] know yourselves, [you shall also know that sons] you are of the [almighty] Father, and you shall know yourselves [to be] in [the city of God], and you ar the [city]."⁴³

This second Saying is new and rather hard to understand. Professor Swete finds the key to its meaning in the word "to draw." The Greek equivalent of the verb occurs only twice in the New Testament,⁴⁴ and in both cases it has the meaning of dragging a resisting body. The moral influence on the soul of a person is expressed by a different form of the verb.⁴⁵ But other writers employ the Greek verb as it is found in the papyrus in the sense of exercising a moral influence.⁴⁶ Supposing this to be the real sense of the verb in our Saying, we detect in it an allusion to Jesus' words concerning the birds of the air and the lilies of the field.⁴⁷ The passage, therefore, does not establish the common place contrast, "the kingdom is in heaven, but you are drawn to this earth;" it rather agrees with St. Paul's teaching that "the invisible things of him . . . are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made."⁴⁸ But the kingdom of God is not only in heaven, it is also within men. This thesis and its natural inference are inculcated in the second half of the Saying.

While the general outline of the meaning contained in the Saying is fairly well agreed upon, its details give rise to a great variety of opinions. Perhaps the main discussion is concerned with the insertion of the epithet "Almighty" after the noun "Father" and the

⁴² Mark x., 24; xiv., 33; Acts iii., 10.

⁴³ Λέγει Ἰησοῦς, τίνες] οἱ ἔλκοντες ἡμᾶς [εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ] ἡ βασιλεία ἐν οὐρανῷ ἐστίν;] τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῶν θηρίων ὅτι ἐν τῇ γῇ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ] οἱ ἰχθύες τῆς θαλάσσης οὗτοι οἱ ἔλκοντες ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐντὸς ὑμῶν [ἐ]στι [καὶ ὅστις ἂν ἑαυτὸν] γνῶ ταύτην εὐρήσκει] ἑαυτοὺς γινώσκει [καὶ εἰδήσετε ὅτι υἱοὶ] ἐστε ὑμεῖς τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ τ[.] γινώσκει ἑαυτοὺς ἐν[.] καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐστέ ἡτο[.].

⁴⁴ Acts xxi., 30; James ii., 6.

⁴⁵ E. g., John vi., 44.

⁴⁶ IV. Mach. xiv., 13; Clem. Al., Strom. VII., ii., 9.

⁴⁷ Matthew vi., 26.

⁴⁸ Romans i., 20.

use of "city" in the last lines. The phrase "Father Almighty" has no parallel in the New Testament and the Septuagint version, though the epithet occurs in connection with "Lord" and "God." Still the expression "Father Almighty" might have been suggested by St. Paul's words, "and I will be a father to you, and you shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty."⁴⁹

It is Professor Blass who first suggested the reading "you are the city;" the abruptness and strangeness of the words in their context as well as the archaic spelling of the Greek original for "city" make against the correctness of the suggestion. But the thought cannot be said to be unknown to the Gospels or even to the first series of Oxyrhynchus Sayings. It is allied to St. Matthew's city placed upon a mountain, and to the expressions "you are the salt of the earth," "you are the light of the world."

Logion III. "Jesus saith, A man shall not hesitate . . . to ask . . . concerning his place [in the kingdom. Ye shall know] that many that are first shall be last, and the last first, and [they shall have eternal life]."⁵⁰

The restoration of the third Saying is most difficult. The second half agrees so well with Mark x., 31, that its interpretation cannot be very doubtful. And since the words discourage undue confidence in reference to the final reward, Professor Swete suggests the ending "and few shall find it" instead of the editors' interpretation, "and they shall have eternal life." In the first half of the Saying, too, all would be simple if the papyrus did not exhibit any gaps, but presented only the words of which we are now certain, "a man will not hesitate to inquire about the place." Now, either side of the infinitive "to inquire" presents a gap that must be filled with words, two of which are more closely determined by their last syllable and one by its first syllable. Professor Swete suggests the restoration "a man will not hesitate to inquire boldly about the seasons." The last phrase is suggested to him by Mark xiii., 33, "ye know not when the time is," and by Acts i., 7, "it is not for you to know the times or moments." Finally, the middle portion of the *Logion* is interpreted by Professor Swete as meaning "prating of the place of glory." In the Greek participle he finds a parallel to Luke xxiv., 11; "the place" is illustrated by John xiv., 2, and Acts i., 25; finally, the expression "glory" has its equivalent in John xvii., 22.

Logion IV. "Jesus saith, Everything that is not before thy face and that which is hidden from thee shall be revealed to thee. For

⁴⁹ II. Cor. vi., 18.

⁵⁰ λέγει Ἰησοῦς, οὐκ ἀποκνήσει ἀνθ[ρωπος] ρων ἐπερωτῆσαι πε[.]
 μιν περὶ τοῦ τόπου τῆ[ς] σπερὶ οὗτοι πολλοὶ εἰσονται π[ρώτοι ἐσχατοὶ καὶ] οἱ
 ἐσχατοὶ π[ρώτοι καὶ] σιν.

there is nothing hidden which shall not be made manifest, or buried which shall not be raised."⁵¹

This Saying is a blending of Matthew x., 26, and Luke viii., 17, so that it agrees with the synoptic tradition. At the same time, it exhibits a distinctively Johannine word in the Greek original of the noun "face;" besides, the ending may refer to John v., 28 f., "all that are in the graves shall . . . come forth." But it is quite possible that the ending alludes to Matthew xiii., 44, "the kingdom of heaven is like unto a treasure hidden in a field." It appears not to have been uncommon in Palestine to bury a treasure in the ground for the sake of security. Even now the spade of the laborer at times unearths such hidden treasures. In this connection the Saying states "nothing is buried which shall not be raised."

Logion V. "His disciples enquire of him and say, How shall we fast? and how shall we [pray? and how are we to give alms? and of such duties] also what are we to observe? Jesus saith, [See that you lose not your reward.] Do nothing [save the things that] belong to the truth, [for if you do these, ye shall know a hidden mystery. I say unto you,] Blessed is he [. . .]."⁵²

The textual condition of this last *Logion* is so wretched that the editors have not attempted a restoration. The above English rendering follows the interpretation of Professor Swete. The reader will readily perceive the subject of the Saying. The disciples question Jesus, and He answers, quite after the manner of the Synoptic Gospels. The question must have arisen out of an instruction on almsgiving, prayer and fasting. We find something similar, if not identical, in the Sermon on the Mount. Still it may be seen how uncertain Professor Swete's restoration is, if we compare it with that published by Mr. Barnes in the *Guardian* July 20, 1904. For the latter seems to find in the Saying a parallel to Matthew xix., 16-22, and Luke xviii., 18-22, interpreting the end of the *Logion*, "and what must we observe in order to have life? Jesus saith. Do not act as the hypocrites. For they oppose the way of the truth, and they lose the hidden reward. And blessed is he for whom there is a reward in heaven."

After reviewing the two series of *Logia* we may ask whether they may be regarded as two distinct parts of the same collection. Whatever view the editors may have defended, Mgr. Batiffol denies that the two series belong to one work. Here are his reasons: 1. It

⁵¹ Λέγει Ἰησοῦς, [πάν τὸ μὴ ἐμπροσ[θεν τῆς ὀψείας σου καὶ τὸ κεκρυμμένον] ἀπὸ σου ἀποκαλυφθήσεται αἱ σοί. οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν κρυπτόν ὃ οὐ φανε[ρὸν γενήσεται] καὶ τεθαμμένον ὃ οὐκ ἐγερθήσεται].

⁵² [Ἐξ]ητάζουσιν αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ λέγουσιν. πῶς νηστεύ[σομεν καὶ πῶς] μεθεα καὶ πῶς [.] καὶ τί παρατηρή[σομεν]; λέγει Ἰησοῦς, [.] εἴται μὴ ποιῇτε[.] ἡς ἀληθείας ἀν[.] ἀ[π]οκεκρ[υ] μα[κάρι]ός[τε] ἐστιν [.] ὡς ἐστ[.] ἰν[.].

is by no means certain that the *Logia* of 1904 are part of an extensive collection; the papyrus may have been intended as a kind of phylactery. 2. The Sayings of 1897 were uniform in their use of the phrase "Jesus saith," while those of 1904 do not present the same uniformity. 3. The *Logia* of 1897 were found to be related to the Gospels of St. Matthew, St. Luke and St. John, but not to the Gospel according to the Hebrews. 4. Finally, the Sayings of 1897 are called *Logia*, those of 1904 are called *Logoi*.

Moreover, the Sayings of 1904 appear to stand wholly outside the field of investigation concerning the *Logia*-collections properly so-called. These latter precede, according to our present-day criticism, our Synoptic Gospels and were utilized by the evangelists as sources. They certainly did not derive their authority from the name of an Apostle, be it St. Thomas or any other. The method of appealing to an Apostle's name agrees with the mental attitude of the second century, the century of pseudo-apostolic apocryphal writings. It is, therefore, the Introduction of the 1904 *Logia* that assigns them to a post-apostolic age.

And here again it may be asked whether the collection presents detached and sporadic Sayings, or extracts from extra-canonical Gospels that circulated in the second century. Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt incline towards the former of these alternatives, mainly on account of the negative argument that we cannot be certain from what extra-canonical Gospel the Sayings were chosen. The *Logia* contain, on the one hand, a quotation from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and on the other they present a Johannine coloring incompatible with the Gospel to the Hebrews. Shall we say, therefore, that the Sayings of 1904 were chosen from different sources? This hardly agrees with the words of the Introduction, in which the Sayings are derived from the Lord's manifestations made to St. Thomas. Mgr. Batiffol points out that this argument does not prove. The Introduction is not necessarily the work of the compiler; most probably it was copied just as the Sayings were excerpted. Again, the Johannine coloring in the Sayings of 1904 may be reduced to the phrase "shall not taste death," a phrase that might have been employed even by an opponent of the writings of St. John.

When Mgr. Batiffol comes to state his own opinion as to the origin of the Sayings, he refers us to Professor Sanday's view as to the origin of the *Logia* published in 1897. They are a product of the first half of the second century; they do not spring directly from our canonical Gospels, but from conditions of thought created by the canonical Gospels. Professor Swete modifies this view to a certain extent: "While it is possible that certain of the Sayings were excerpted from non-canonical Gospels, there is no convinc-

ing evidence that this was so; it is open to us to believe that the compiler was indebted wholly or chiefly to the floating traditions of the second century—traditions based on the recollections of those who had heard the Lord, or who, like Papias, had made it their business to inquire from survivors of the first generation what the Apostles and other disciples had said about Him.”

Are the two series of Sayings to be regarded as conveying the actual words of Jesus? More than one-half of their contents is duplicated in the canonical Gospels; of this portion of the Sayings we need not treat here. The rest is certainly commended to our confidence by its company. Not as if these Sayings contained the very words of Jesus; they certainly exhibit more modifications of the actual utterances of Jesus than we meet with in the canonical Gospels. But it is not at all unreasonable to suppose that they go back to original utterances of Jesus, and that they reproduce in Greek with considerable faithfulness thoughts which Jesus uttered in Aramaic. Professor Swete modifies this view to some extent: “The Sayings must be judged severally, each on its own merits, without regard to the order in which they stand or their supposed connection with a particular Apostle. So judged, they will be found, I venture to think, not wholly unworthy of the Supreme Teacher of mankind.”

And do the Sayings teach us anything that is really new concerning the person or the doctrine of Jesus? There is nothing sensational in the *Logia*, nothing that changes our view of Jesus or our interpretation of His teaching. Our faith and our principles of Christian morality are not at all affected by the discovery. At the same time, the Christian apologist and archæologist find their respective field of work enlarged. The practical moralist, too, finds certain applications of revealed principles in the Sayings that were not formerly regarded as directly emanating from Jesus. Nature and the animal life about us, we are told, speak of God and draw us to Him; the kingdom of God is within us, and we shall find it by self-knowledge. These thoughts are in harmony with Jesus’ teaching, but they are not expressly stated in the Gospels.⁵⁸

A. J. MAAS, S. J.

Woodstock, Md.

⁵⁸ The *Logia* are not the only gospel-material discovered by Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt. They have also brought to light a small roll containing part of a gospel hitherto wholly unknown. The writing appears to belong to the third century; lines 1-16 contain the end of a discourse of Jesus similar to the Sermon on the Mount; lines 17-23 give a question of the disciples and an answer of the Master; the remaining portion is almost entirely undecipherable. The following is a translation of what can be read: “[Take no thought] from morning until evening, nor from evening until morning, either for your food what ye shall eat, or for your raiment what ye shall put

A PROVENÇAL RENASCENCE.

IT IS a strange fact that a literary impulse should originate in a source associated with the forces of war and destruction.

We live in an age of anomalies, sometimes more glaring than any ever invented by the fantastic contrivers of "Pinafore," "Patience" and other musical satires of a harmless school. Millionaires, rich as Croesus, displaying a feverish anxiety to discover means of dissipating the riches they had shown a still more feverish anxiety to gain, form one of its distinctive claims to novelty. Inventors of death-dealing agencies in war—labor-saving contrivances in shambles work, as they may be sarcastically described—are seen in the temple of Peace, mildly presiding over schemes for the encouragement of learning and science and philosophy. A good case in illustration is the Nobel prize scheme in Sweden; another hardly less striking is the system of Rhodes scholarships. Mr. Nobel made his immense fortune by his discoveries in the realm of deadly explosives; and Mr. Rhodes in contriving the extinction of the South African Dutch Republics. They are two typical benefactors of the human race, as modern ideals go. But we must make allowances for a little incongruity; no age is perfection, and it may not be otherwise in our generation.

The Nobel foundation is one of the most generous ever devised. It fixes no limits as to race or language or country in the awarding of its prizes. Supreme excellence in the intellectual sphere is the sole test of merit. The truly catholic spirit of the foundation is shown in the fact that the prize went last year to two literary men who do not belong to Sweden, the country of the founder. It was divided between Frédéric Mistral, a representative Provençal poet and enthusiast for the past, and Don Jose Echegaray, a famous dramatic author of Spain. The award is a singular one, many will think; but the judges who made it do not travel in the beaten paths. Literature has many sides, and some of these are unknown to many who talk and write the most profoundly on the subject, as though the field were their exclusive property.

Although Mistral represents an anachronism, he is a very inter-

on. Ye are far better than the lilies which grow but spin not. Having one garment, what do ye [lack]? Who could add to your stature? He himself will give you your garment. His disciples say unto him, when wilt thou be manifest to us, and when shall we see thee? He saith, When ye shall be stripped and not be ashamed. . . . He said, The Key of knowledge ye hid; ye entered not in yourselves, and to them that were entering in ye opened not."

esting figure. He is the embodiment of an ideal. Were one to back to life the figures in the fading canvases and put flesh and blood into the suits of war harness that stand in rows along the walk down the corridor of an ancient feudal castle and could conjure floor, the speech and action of these would be not less out of place with the conventions of to-day than the literature and art that Mistral seeks to perpetuate and glorify.

Yet it had its period of glory, more lasting and widespread in its cult than many of those that rose, only to sink unmourned, since the doctrine of the beautiful mother-cult of all, that of the imperishable Greek. For more than three centuries the witchery of the Provençal vogue held all civilized Europe enthralled, and, by means of the Crusades, had made itself known even in the East. It was the poetical and literary and musical expression of all that was understood by the word "chivalry." And yet when it had attained its full flower, it went the way of all flowers that are suffered to run to seed. From the sublime and knightly it deteriorated into the erotic and the frivolous. Yet even in this debased form it preserved a peculiar grace and a false winsomeness that irresistibly appeals to the less robust and judicious in mental leanings—just as Watteau, with his pretty shepherdesses and courtier-like swains, appeals to a certain order of connoisseurs in art more powerfully than the creations of Cimabue or Michael Angelo ever could.

The Provençal dialect stands in much the same relation to the grand Latin mother tongue as the Italian dialect adopted by Dante in his poetical work. Provence by its name tells of its own origin. It was the old Roman "Province" par excellence—the direct offshoot of the masterful Commonwealth when it was in the heyday of its colonizing fever. In the far away days the strict and sonorous Latin was spoken there in purity as exacting as in Rome itself, but gradually a change came, as in Italy. The "barbarian" began to make himself felt in even the sphere of letters and refinement. The Celtic speech, the tongue of the common people all over Gaul, ate into the Latin of the conquerors, in the South as well as in the North of France, producing the *langue d'Oc* and the *langue d'Oil*. Of the former the Provençal was the direct offspring; of the other the Walloon. Norman French left no literature, save legal enactments and royal charters in England, and certain phrases that may still be seen as notices to visitors in the great Norman keep of the Tower of London and certain cartularies in ancient abbeys of Norman foundation. The Provençal is still a spoken dialect over a considerable area of the South, but its use is confined to the common people. Mistral and some other lovers of the old tongue are doing much to instil an enthusiasm for it, and all it represents,

among the better classes. These efforts coincide with the movement in Ireland to restore the old Gaelic tongue. But in the one case it is a dialect that its lovers would reanimate, while the other seeks for the restoration of a full-blooded language, the oldest probably now extant. There is hardly any just comparison between the respective literatures. While both are imaginative and artistic, the one is the grandeur of the tragic stage, the other the dalliance of the comic operetta and the forced witticism of the court jesters. Yet, if the proper study of mankind be man, literature, no matter of what sort or quality, must ever be worthy the study of the scholar and the thinker, because literature represents not merely a school of speech and grammatical form, but a field of thought and the action of ideas upon the formation of character and social life. The influence of climate and environment in shaping the tone and imagery of literature, whether in poetry or prose, is a question that may also be usefully considered when pondering over the respective revivals, or attempted revivals, by the shores of the Atlantic and by the Mediterranean seaboard. Provence, being a territory of sunshine and flowers and soft, languorous breezes, must have ever appealed to all that is sensuous in man or maid. Ireland is of a harder texture, both as to climate and soil. While it is rich, it offers that variety in look and mood that indicates how nature relies on opposites to produce her choicest effects in either mind or physique.

However wide the disparity, the temperament of poets in regard to worldly matters appears to be much the same. Mistral has no sense of thrift; he turns over his Nobel prize to the public use in his beloved Provence, whose representative museum at Arles already contains much of his personal store invested in the purchase of quaint works illustrating her old arts and sciences, her old fancies in bric-a-brac, her old solid style of furniture building, her old adherence to all that conjoined the useful with the beautiful. Your true poet owns no kinship with your miser or even your man of ordinary prudence; he is ever a heedless spendthrift who takes no thought of the morrow, but trusts in God as innocently as do the birds.

The *langue d'Oc* was not confined to French territory; it existed over large portions of Spain, notably Aragon, Navarre and Castile. When this parlance began no one can affirm; it is older than the history of those regions. In the Balearic Isles, where it also prevailed, it existed as a common vehicle of thought down to the eighteenth century, according to Bastero, a learned antiquarian, who wrote on the subject in the year 1724. It was kept alive, and finally brought into a state of elegance by means of the tribe of

wandering minstrels—a class who at length obtained definite recognition south of the Loire as Troubadours, and north of it, in France, as Trouveres. In most civilized countries literature and poetry had their origin in the common impulse of mankind to hear a story or listen to a song. The nomadic poet was to be found in every European country from Hellas to the Hebrides, ages before the advent of the missionary of the Gospel. In Celtic lands especially he became an institution. In Roman time he flourished in Gallia and Iberia, but the severe dignity of the Latin writer would not permit him to recognize one who merely sought to amuse where he felt it his duty to chronicle hard facts. Thus there is no mention of the class in the histories until after the eighth century, when they are slightly referred to as either *joculatores*, *ministrales*, *scuriæ*, *mimi* and similar semi-scornful terms—showing that they filled the rôle of buffoons or jesters or circus clowns, as we understand these avocations, for a very long period ere they took on the airs of respectability and evolved the class of rhymers and chroniclers of romantic chivalry. In the Middle Ages they were generally classified as *jongleurs*—a term which furnished us with the modern appellation, juggler, and intimates that the wandering minstrel was a sort of variety performer whose *metier* included sleight-of-hand and feats of equilibrium as well as story-telling. From the *jongleurs* also came the race of court jesters. The minstrels, who formed another branch of the same stock, were in many cases rhymers as well as performers on the lute and harp. They introduced rhyme-endings, according to several authorities; as before their time the classic Latin looked only for rhythm and quantity in poetical composition, caring nothing for assonance. Mediæval Latin, however, departed from this severe tradition, doubtless finding that the rhymed endings made the musical services of the Church more popular and so more effective for the Church's great mission. It may be doubted, however, whether the Provençal minstrels were really the inventors of the new departure in poetry, inasmuch as very early poems in Irish were composed according to that system. It is claimed by some authors that the Irish poets were the first to invent and introduce the rhymic method in the gentle art. If this claim be well founded, it is not improbable that Languedoc borrowed the idea from Erin, since there was considerable intercourse between France and Ireland even at that very remote period. The wandering minstrel of the South had his prototype or counterpart in the wandering bard or *filcadh* of the Green Isle—a very much more robust and aggressive personage, according to many historians, however, than the gentle troubadour or trouvere of Southern Gaul.

In tracing the operative factors of post-Roman civilization, it will be found that the wandering poets and minstrels played probably the most important part of any. Going about from camp to camp and from castle to cottage, they formed a social link that bound all classes in a common tie of friendship and patriotism. They brought sunshine and gaiety wherever they went. They were ever the children of mirth and joyous camaraderie. No doubt the jests might at times, to our modern ears, sound coarse, but they were usually witty, and early manners knew nothing of the artificial delicacy of a more refined age. Sometimes the *jongleur* or minstrel was a potent agency in war. Those who came with the Northmen used to hearten the marching warriors by the fierce chant of Rollo's battle hymn; and we read of William of Normandy going to the tryst at Hastings preceded by the *jongleur* Taillifer who dexterously tossed his sword into the air and caught it falling, as he chanted the same ominous note of barbarous conquest.

There is no reliable date for the beginning of Troubadour poetry. It is pretty certain, however, that in its earliest form it was a crude and formless sort of folk-lore passed on from one generation to another. The popular taste was satisfied by the style which until lately in Ireland was set by the race called "ballad singers"—a rancous loud-lunged set, who sang or roared, solus or in duet, rambling "lamentations" or satires like "The Peeler and the Goat," to airs distorted from the inimitable masterpieces of Irish music. But a change set in about the twelfth century. Manners took on a refinement previously unknown; a taste for the æsthetic began to show in the growing dawn of a great awakening. The coarse and rugged rhymes would no longer satisfy the aspiring mind. It was the spirit of knighthood which gave the upward impulse; and it was in the promptings of religion that this spirit had its source. The Crusades brought this new life into Europe—a life that was destined in a short time to renovate all things, in art, in letters, in song. The spirit of chivalry demanded a freer exercise of hospitality. Open house was kept by the great feudal lords, and minstrel and *jongleur* were encouraged to essay a higher art by rich presents from prince and baron—gay apparel, fine steeds and liberal largesse. The poet began now to be a man of consequence, where formerly he was tolerated as an inevitable but amusing sort of "poor relation." So enviable became the position of the strolling caterer that it excited the envy of the more regular class of poets. We learn from the work of Friedrich Diez, a great German authority on Troubadour poetry, how this sentiment of jealousy sometimes found expression. He quotes some lines of Philip Mouskes, a Norman poet of the thirteenth century, bearing on the subject:

Quar quant li buens rois Charlemaïne
Ot tout mise a son demaine
Provence qin mult est plentive
De vins, de bois, d'algue, de rive,
As leceours, as menstreux
Qul sont au ques luxurieux
Le donna toute e departi.

This bit of Norman-French is thus translated: "When Charlemagne had brought all countries under his dominion, he made over and divided the whole of Provence, which is rich in wine, woods and rivers, among the luxurious musicians and minstrels."

For a couple of centuries from that epoch of prosperity the Troubadour's lot was a happy one. But thenceforward it began to feel the tooth of change. The immense expense incurred by the nobles in the Crusades, and the gradual encroachment of the town burgher class upon the power of the feudal nobility diminished the resources which enabled Kings, princes and nobles to give generous encouragement to the civilizing and softening art of the poet and the musician. When Dante arose the race of Troubadours had almost died out. He makes mention of some of the earlier celebrities in his "Divina Commedia," but nowhere refers to contemporary stars. So we may conclude, perhaps, that none were then visible in the poetical firmament. But it is undeniable that it was from the Troubadours that chivalry came into Italy. Books of chivalry were in great demand in Europe, especially in Spain, for long after the disappearance of the Troubadours from the stage; nor did the taste for reading these stilted productions cease until Cervantes arose to kill the noble hedonism by his solemn ridicule.

The art of the Troubadours was not confined to music and poetry; it also included elocution. The age being not a learned one, few understood the art of reading properly. Hence the scholars who could read and write with faultless precision were very highly esteemed by their less gifted auditors. To read the poetry and the romances of chivalry with such emphasis and sympathy as to move the hearts of knights and fair dames was an accomplishment diligently cultivated by the brilliant sons of song. This function was more particularly discharged by the jongleurs than by the Troubadours; but it often happened that the same individual was an adept in all.

As the art of the Troubadours grew into favor year after year, so did its quality become more and more refined. It was not merely the common people who hung upon their poetry and their romances, not merely knights and noble ladies, but even royalty itself became their munificent patrons and was even found in their ranks. Several monarchs belonged to them. Alfonso of Aragon was one; King Richard of England another, according to some

chroniclers of the age of the Crusades. Kings Peter the Second and Third and Alfonso the Ninth ((all of Aragon) also favored them highly; the Counts of Provence and Barcelona were their steadfast friends for many years. At the Papal Court in Avignon they were always welcome; indeed their decline synchronized very nearly with the departure of that court for Rome. The gradual loss of wealthy patrons was the immediate cause of the decline of the Troubadour's art.

Much is claimed for the influence of the Pagan Renaissance upon literature and art. Savonarola denounced it as the harbinger of the material and the sensual. Certainly the age of romance in poetry and literature was the age of the ideal. Although in the beginning of the Provençal cult there was a large strain of sensuality, gradually the truer notion of the beautiful prevailed over the merely erotic, and when the great passion of the Crusades swept over Europe the height of religious emotion inspired the song of the Troubadour to its best flights. Historians of the Provençal movement divide its poetry into two principal classes—the love songs and the satirical and warlike lays, which they called *sirventes*. The *sirvente* was sub-divided again into three kinds—the political, the moral and the personal. The first deal with the affairs of the world at large and of Provence in especial; the second satirized the vices and follies of the time, and the third related to individual or personal concerns of a minor nature. Elegies on the death of patrons, or eulogies if alive, were also classified under the head of *sirventes*. There was one other very favorite form of poetry, called the *tenson*. This was a composition in the shape of a dialogue, wherein one party took up and challenged the propositions of the other. The theme was usually of love and the problems and considerations arising out of that passion. There was much subtle casuistry and intricacy displayed in the attack and the defense alike; and often the treatment of the subject was such as would not bear translation into modern English, for polite ears. That they were listened to without a qualm by noble knights and dames of the choicest caste, in the earlier centuries of a civilization that was regarded as refined only proves that there was a different standard and a simpler point of view—and mayhap an honester one—from what is now held by the *illuminati*. There was also an air of artificiality in many of the amorous compositions, imparted for the purpose of conveying the idea that the phraseology and the imagery were not indicative of any more than a poetical indulgence in an imaginary passion—a passing platonism affected out of gallantry and a chivalric conventionality. Thus it was not regarded as im-

proper in a married lady to accept the poetical compliments of a Troubadour, inasmuch as there was no real homage intended. But there were many cases where this conventionalism masked a guilty passion, and often a terrible tragedy put a period to the song and the singer, and mayhap to his *inamorata* as well.

Tensons were usually in the nature of double or duet poems. Each verse contained a proposition, affirmative or otherwise, that was answered in the succeeding verse. The tenson not infrequently assumed a form that might be described as poetical dialectics or casuistry. It debated such fine points as "which are the greater, the pleasures or the pains of love?" "Must a woman do as much for her lover as he for her?" and so on. In these days many of the questions debated in the tensons would be regarded as indelicate; in the times when they were composed they did not shock, since under the artificial code of chivalry which succeeded the real one a latitude was permitted in the discussion of morals much the same as between doctor and patient or lawyer and client in our own days.

Several other metrical forms were embraced in the Troubadours' curriculum. There was the *Chanson*, the *Son*, or *sonet*, the *Alba*, the *Serena* and the *Planh*, or elegy—all of which had their set form of rhythm and metre. Of these various ancient forms the *sonet*, or modern sonnet, is the principal survivor. The character of the *planh*, or elegy, may be, perhaps, judged of by the famous poem on the death of Sir John Moore, which is said by some critics to be an English adaptation of an old Norman composition on the death of a gallant Crusader. In the same way the stirring French air and poem, "*Partant pour la Syrie*," would seem to be an inheritance from the days of the Troubadours—a good specimen of the more martial class of the *sirventes*.

In Walter Scott's wild and semi-crazed romance, "*Anne of Geierstein*," much space is devoted to this phase of Provençal literature, and some revolting instances are cited in illustration of the baneful effects of "metaphysical" or platonic attachments such as subsisted between noble ladies and their Troubadour cavaliers. It should be remembered, however, that exaggeration in many things was a necessary part of Scott's art. This tendency is especially noticeable in his dissertations and notes on the Troubadours, and it degenerates into the extravagant in the picture he draws of King René of Anjou, in the same novel. Other literary artists have treated the same theme and with more historical fidelity, we would be inclined to opine. Scott presents us with a mad monarch, whose conduct at times sinks to the level of lunacy or buffoonery, rather than a poet and musician and lover of the æsthetic, which King

Réné seems really to have been. Henrik Hertz, a Danish Jew and a poet of much eminence, has dealt with the subject in a much more becoming way, in the shape of a dramatic poem of considerable length, entitled "King René's Daughter." The King had in fact two daughters—one the much-stricken Margaret of Anjou, whom Shakespeare defamed so terribly, as a queen "with the heart of a tigress," in his play of "Henry VI.;" the other Yoland or Iolanthe—the heroine of the romance so often treated, "Tristan and Iolanthe." With these the aged and chivalrous King spent the later years of his life, after he had lost much of his worldly possessions, in comparative happiness—a gentleman, a poet and a musician to the last. Mr. Theodore Martin, who translated Hertz's work into English, describes King René in very different terms from either Scott or Shakespeare. "He was, as Hertz depicts him," he says, "a brave, generous, pious and cultivated gentleman. Some of his literary works still exist, and we have a strong impression that we have heard of songs that are attributed to him being still sung in Provence."

Chivalry was running to seed, however, in the later part of the fifteenth century, when King René flourished. Jean Notredame (or Nostradamus), one of the most scholarly of the Troubadours, laments the decay which had fallen upon the fine flower, and explained it ingenuously thus: "Mais defaillans des Mecenaz, defaillarent aussi les poetes." The Crusades, however, would seem to have been the main cause of the decline. These woke up the better nature of man. The hands that could wield the battle axe and the great two-handled sword on Moslem crests felt shame at twanging the strings of rebeck or lute or listening to artificial chansons on the wife of some other or stories of imaginary heroism while the field of the real summoned brave hearts to be up and doing for the defense of Christendom.

Many of the political *sirventes* were poetical calls to arms under the banner of the Cross. Although a considerable air of labor and artigciality characterizes most of such efforts, owing to the rules of rhyme and metre then prevalent, some even under straight-jacket conditions, display much strength and beauty. This one of Pons de Capadenil's, for instance, displays both ingenuity in rhyme and deep religious feeling happily blended :

Our guide and our protector now is He
 Who led the Three Kings erst, to Bethlehem wending:
 His mercy points the way for all to flee
 Which all who with true hearts are thither tending
 Will find is one that's in salvation ending.
 How mad, how mad indeed, must that man be
 Who scorns the Cross thus from perversity
 And only after worldly wealth contending,
 His honor losing and his God offending!

See then how great must that one's folly be
 Who does not take up arms! Our Saviour, bending
 Toward his disciples, said: "Come, follow Me—
 Out from your hearts all worldly thoughts first sending."
 Unto His word the time's come for attending.
 More than who lives has he who o'er the sea
 Dies for His name; who lives has less than he
 Who gains a victory over Death, expending
 His life to purchase happiness ne'er ending.

Then 'fore the Cross all humbly bend thy knee!
 Thus from thy sins all punishment forefending:
 For on the Cross there died, to set thee free,
 That Saviour who, the penitent thief befriending
 At the last hour, left to his fate impending
 The scoffing sinner. By the Cross saved He
 The wretches struggling in perdition's sea,
 Thus by His death our souls from death defending.
 Oh, woe to him who scorns this love transcending!

How vain will all ambition's victories be
 If we neglect upon our God depending!
 Great Alexander, who from sea to sea
 Had conquered all, what had he at life's ending
 But a poor shroud? Oh, folly past defending
 To choose the evil when the good we see—
 That which will fade, not what eternally
 Will live! This ever to the world attending
 Blinds us to sin and keeps us from amending.

And let no baron deem that he can be
 Held a true Knight but by assistance lending
 To set the Sepulchre of Jesus free.
 Arms, honor, chivalry are blending
 To call him to the field: his hither tending
 Is his sole claim to Heaven's felicity,
 Which well a prize for Kings and Counts may be:
 Their high deeds there, in that good cause contending,
 Their souls from flames and endless pains forefending.

The aged and the cripple who would be
 Spared from the struggle may their wealth by spending
 In the good cause purchase immunity,
 'Steal of themselves their riches o'er sea sending.
 But woe to those who, sure of God offending,
 Nor go nor send! What will their feelings be
 When at the last day God shall say: "For thee,
 Thou false of heart, I died?" Oh, direful ending!
 The justest then may dread his fate impending.

The foregoing translation (which was anonymous) preserves the metre and the rhyme-ending repetitions of the original very faithfully, according to Professor Diez and other critics. It must be owned that it was somewhat of a *tour de force* to compose a poem of any length hampered by such laws of composition as the old Provençal cult imposed.

That gallant soldier, Richard of the Lion Heart, was a great patron of the Troubadours, if not actually one of the tuneful band himself. His mother, Queen Eleanor, was also a liberal patroness of the order, because, doubtless, they had sung her praises in terms that did not minimize her deserts.

Dante makes mention of a fiery and romantic Troubadour, Bertran de Born, as one whom he wished to personify as "War." His choice appears to have been fully justified, since Bertran was

always looking out for adventures in which the sword and lance were the most reliable agencies. Bertran was a close friend of King Richard, as well as of his brothers, each of whom he used to address with as much familiarity as Falstaff did "Prince Hal." He was a good deal of the Berserker in his warlike temperament. Raynouard, one of the Troubadour chroniclers, describes a call to arms which he addressed to King Richard as a piece "*semble avoir été inspirée par l'ivresse du carnage*" (the intoxication of slaughter). The description seems apt:

It joys me well, the sweet springtide, when leaves and flowers appear;
It joys me well by greenwood side the blithe bird's song to hear;
But more, perdi! I joy to see the tented field afar,
And steed and knight arrayed for fight, in panoply of war!

It joys me well when outscouts fleet before their foemen run,
For then, full short, the main hosts meet, the tug of war comes on!
I love to see the castle storm'd, when thundering fragments fall,
And in the ditch the pallsades smile grim beneath the wall!

* * * * *
Meat, drink, and sleep, I'll not deny, are good things in their way,
But give me, sirs, the war cry that drowns the din of fray,
When knightless steeds through forest glades shriek wildly as they go,
And wounded men cry out for aid within the foss below!

Ye barons that have ought to pledge, in God's name pledge it now,
And mortgage town and tower and land for sword and axe and bow.
Off, off, friend Papiol; bear with haste to "Oc and No" my song,
And bid him speed the good old trade: we have had peace too long!

Papiol was Bertran's *jongleur*, and "Oc and No" was the pet name by which Bertran always referred to the warrior King—"Richard Yea and Nay."

Although some of the lyrics of the Troubadour period are erotic and even gross in character, and many of the tales relate to acts of gross sensuality, it must not be deduced that the influence of Provençalism was generally for evil. On the contrary, we learn from the highest authority that it was the inspiration of the spirit of chivalry and true knighthood. There was nothing of evil attributed when a knight devoted himself to the service of some noble lady, even though she were married. When knight or lady forgot their moral obligations the fact was regarded with horror, and the knight was forever barred, if not done to death by the injured husband, from the society of honorable gentlemen. In a movement extending over so large an area, in several countries—France, Spain and Italy—and covering so great a stretch of time, as the Provençal did, naturally there must have been moral lapses. But on the whole, the bond of chivalry was well maintained. Even though amorous poetry was written, the sentiments which found expression were mostly artificial, and had no deeper meaning than the complimentary phrases which in our own time are heard in social life, on ceremonious occasions. The attachments which existed between ladies and their cavaliers were mostly of the platonic order. Sometimes

they were sublimely so—notably in the case of Dante and his divinity, the fair Beatrice; perhaps also in the case of Petrarch and his Laura—certainly in that of Laura, whatever may have been the wishes and hopes of Petrarch. Spiritual love was never more truly exemplified than in the case of Dante. It finds exquisite expression in his references to Beatrice in the “*Divina Commedia*.” In his “*Vita Nuova*” he himself tells us how it grew on him from the moment he first beheld her. She was then but nine years old, and he was falling into the vale of years. Italian maidens are often more than children at such an age; she must have been exceptionally advanced in beauty of person and mind. She was the daughter of a wealthy Florentine, Falco Portinari, the founder of the Hospital of Santa Maria Nuova. Dante was instantly charmed by the delightful vision which that day burst on him. “From that time forth, I say,” he wrote, “that love held sovereign empire over my soul, which had so readily been betrothed unto him. . . . Oftentimes he enjoined me to strive, if so I might behold this youngest of the angels.” It was this ideal love which, he says, raised him “above the common herd” (*Hell* ii., 105); and it was she, he again declares, “taught him to love virtue” (*Purg.* xxx., 123), and “from slave to freedom brought him” (*Par.* xxxi., 75). At the second time he saw her, which was nine years later, she must have been then a beautiful woman. She spoke some gracious words to him. They fired him so that he sat down and penned some sonnets to her. She was soon after married to Simon di Bardi, a wealthy Florentine. Still the poet continued to send her sonnets full of delicate praise. No offense was caused by this, for such was the practice of chivalry in that romantic age. There was something truly elevating in such attachments as these, when loyally observed. The custom had undoubtedly much to do in softening the asperities of a turbulent age and smoothing the way for a higher plane of civilization.

Some writers assert that there was an institution among the Troubadours called the Court of Love, whose function it was to determine knotty points in affairs of the heart; but Professor Diez casts doubt upon the belief. It is certain, however, that one of the prominent poets, Maître Ermengan, composed a poem of enormous length—twenty-seven thousand verses—called the “*Breviary of Love*.” But this work is really more a philosophical treatise embodying all the knowledge of the age, than a composition *à la* Ovid.

Some of the very earliest of the Provençal literary works were on religious subjects. An eminent author, M. Raynouard, describes one of these, the “*Life of Boethius*” (only a fragment of which is known to exist), as “the most ancient monument of the romance language that we now possess.”

Several other religious poems, of very great age, are amongst the memorials of the beginnings of Provençal literature. The most important of these is in the form of a dramatic work—and believed by M. Raynouard to be the very earliest attempt at dramatic composition in any modern language—entitled the “Mystery of the Wise and the Foolish Virgins. There are several religious compositions in the shape of Legends of Saints; and there is also a long chronicle in rhyme, by Guillaume de Tudela (A. D. 1210-1220) describing the wars against the Albigenes.

The modern story of “Parsifal” seems to have been an evolution of a mediæval legend of Provence. Wolfram von Eschenbach declared that he had derived his story of “Titurel and Perceval” from the Provençal of Master Kyot or Guiot.

Although it is known that many prose and poetical romances adorned the literature of Provence, only a few are now to be found. The principal ones are “Gerard de Rossillon,” “Janfre, the Son of Dovon,” “Ferebras” and “Philomena.” The paucity of these compositions has surprised the students of Provençal letters, since it is claimed for the country where they originated that it was the cradle of romantic poetry. This claim is sustained, on the other hand, by the profusion of lyrical works which are to be found, and whose merit is so unequal. In strong contrast to the fewness of the more ambitious compositions of the Troubadour period is the great number of romances produced by the northern Trouveres. Many of these were of great length, ranging from five to ten thousand verses; and opinion is divided as to whether each of these was read or sung at the one sitting, or given with “intervals for refreshments.” The latter hypothesis is evidently the more likely to be correct.

That all the poets and writers of that fascinating age were not exactly in the habit of dropping honey and flowers from their pens at all times is a fact of which indubitable evidence survives. Some of them, like the Irish bards, had tongues or pens like scorpions, and could satirize brother poets and gleemen with raillery as biting as that of Pope or Byron. The gentle arts of “log-rolling” and depreciating were not unknown in the age of chivalry, as the works of both Troubadour and Trouvere attest. Pierre d’Auvergne seems to have been a veritable Jeffreys of the twelfth century. He has left the world an amusing estimate of the various worthies of chivalry and song who flourished contemporaneously with his noble self. In one passage he hits off four:

I will sing of all those Troubadours who sing in different styles. The worst among them think to speak well, but all should repeat their songs somewhere else, for I hear a good hundred herdsmen meddling therewith, not one of whom knows the difference between high and low.

This objection touches Pierre Rogier, and I will therefore censure him first. He sings right openly of love: it would better become him to carry the psalter in church, or the sconces with the great wax lights.

The second is Giraut de Bornell; he compares a cloth burned by the sun to his meagre and woful songs, which are only fit for an old water-carrier. If he could but see himself in a glass he would not give a hep for himself.

The third is Bernart de Ventadour, who is even less by an inch than Bornell: but he had for his father a servant who shot well with a wooden bow, and his mother heated ovens and collected firewood.

The fourth is Brive de Limousin: the most famous jongleur between here and Benevento. When the wretch sings, one may fancy one hears a sick pilgrim. I must almost pity him.

If one might safely say that it is only the mediocre in art who are capable of jealousy and the disparagement of others, then it would be safe to assume that the Troubadours who sang and wrote at that particular epoch were of inferior rank in the gentle profession. But the fact that three or four of them are mentioned by Dante as men of eminence, and taken even as typical Troubadours, must give a different idea. According to the highest standard of their time they held a high plane on the Parnassian hill. Envy and jealousy can rankle even in celestial minds, according to one of the greatest of poets.

But the work of the Troubadours must be considered from a much higher point of view. It is not the individual failings of the race that ought to engage the students' attention, but the influence exerted by the ideals which they set before men's minds. If they sang the praises of beauty somewhat extravagantly, they awakened the nobler part of man in no less effective a way than they did the baser, by the irresistible appeal that aroused the world long before "Arms and the Man" rang forth from the great Mantuan's lyre. If they inspired respect for womanhood, not less did they inflame the mind to the defense of the Christian religion. They were a tremendous factor in the formation of the Crusades and the keeping alive of the impulse that first set these in motion. They softened the asperities of a semi-barbarous age, and kindled the light of literature even amid the flames of war. It was a unique spectacle.

Frédéric Mistral is the leading spirit in the revival of this long neglected cult. His enthusiasm for it is a passion. He claims for the Provençal dialect more than many philologists are disposed to concede. He would have it acknowledged as an independent language, the direct offshoot of the Roman, and the parent of all the other romance languages—French, Italian and Spanish. He is the disciple of an earlier enthusiast, Joseph Roumaunville, who at Avignon, fifty years ago, founded the society of the *Félibrege*, whose purpose was to revive the decaying *langue d'Oc*, and formulate its grammatical and etymological system. The question is, however, largely academic. It is entirely different from the case of the Gaelic revival in Ireland. Most philologists are agreed that the Gaelic is

a pure tongue, with a perfect and scientific system of grammar and syntax; as old evidently as the ancient Greek, mayhap as old as the Hebrew. But the langue d'Oc at best cannot be considered otherwise than as the rearrangement of the fragments of a beautiful broken vase.

It is a characteristic of languages of such a kind that they readily lend themselves to poetical forms. They are more plastic than the iron-bound Latin, for instance, and as euphonious as the musical rhythmy Greek. Scotch dialect and Provençal are very much alike in this respect. Mistral has acquired a high reputation among modern poets for the uses to which he has applied the ancient speech of Provence. His first great work was a great pastoral called "Mirèio," and it dealt with rustic life, its joys and its sorrows, in his native country by the Mediterranean shore. The richness of its vocabulary and the freshness of the imagery employed at once impressed the public mind in France and raised the author to the front rank of modern poets. It was in 1858 that "Mirèio" first came out, and it has never waned in favor since. The Academy awarded its crown to the "Mirèio" and gave the author a prize of two thousand francs and the medal of honor. Two more prizes fell to his lot in 1884, together with the more substantial prize of ten thousand francs, from the Academy; and the Government conferred on him also the grand cordon of the Legion of Honor. Nine years later the author produced another great work under the title of "Calendàn"—an epic of the heroic order. Eight years later he gave the world another fine work—"Lis Isclo d'Oro"—and after another eight years came "Nerto," an epic of the Papal age in Avignon. In 1897 he produced "Le Poeme du Rhone"—a cyclopædic poem, dealing with the country and the people among whom that arrowy river has sped its way since it first sprang down from its source in the mountains. He tells of their lives, their towns, their villages, their customs, their legends and their many picturesque and quaint old communal ways. He sings also with a simple piety. There is none of the modern skeptic about Mistral and his work. He is an old-fashioned man who has been brought up in the love and knowledge of God, and is never ashamed to confess his faith. The many quaint superstitions of the Southern French peasantry find reflection in his works, but he is not ashamed of these traditional things. They may be wrong, but they are of his beloved Provence, racy of the soil and racy of the people; that is enough for him.

Mistral is a delightful study, in this hard, money-grubbing, tense-nerved age. He places before us a panorama of soothing idylls. He gives us to eat of the lotus-leaf, and we have no desire then to return to our hard, grim, repellent daily grind of work and worry.

Perhaps this is why the art of the poets has been called divine. They can minister even to the mind diseased and soothe if not pluck out altogether our rooted sorrows. Therefore was Virgil called the Magician and Scott the Wizard of the North.

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

Philadelphia.

GERALD GRIFFIN.

THE recent occurrence of the natal centenary of Ireland's sweet singer and greatest novelist, Gerald Griffin, called attention anew to the quality of his work as a writer, and to the moral beauty of his character which ranks him with the best types of Catholic laymen that the nineteenth century has produced. A review of his life and work, therefore, would not seem out of place. Not long ago suggestions were heard of a centennial edition of his works. His memory well deserves the honor that such a step would imply. For upon all lovers of pure literature his writings have an unsurpassed claim, whilst for those who can appreciate nobility of character, his life must possess a special charm. And short as that life was, there was nevertheless crowded into it a work destined not soon to perish. Let us glance at both and see whether our examination does not agree with the popular judgment.

In the autumn of the year 1823 there passed over to London from his loved home on the Shannon a young Irishman not yet out of his teens. He went forth, like Burke and Goldsmith and many another son of Erin had gone before him, with a light pocket, but with a light heart and a stock of other wealth—intellect and genius and the irrepressible ambition of youth to win a niche in the temple of fame. Such a capital, however, was potential rather than actual, and before it materialized cost the holder much suffering, bitter disappointment and the surrender of cherished ideals. This youth of fortune was Gerald Griffin. His dearest desire was to win dramatic fame by no less arduous means than the revolutionizing of the dramatic taste of the time. From his early youth he had fostered the ambition of seeing his own work side by side with those of the great playwrights. But the grave had closed over him before his most notable production, "Gisippus," was put on the stage.

His biography, written by his brother, and to which all readers of Griffin must feel indebted, says that our subject was born in

the city of Limerick, on the 12th of December, 1803, "of," it is careful to add, "the old Milesian stock." Not long before this event his father, Patrick Griffin, a considerable farmer, had moved into town from a place called Woodfield, in the neighboring county of Clare (where he had lived for a number of years), in order to secure better educational facilities for his children. However satisfactory in this respect the change of residence may have been, it was not so in regard to his business in Limerick—the management of a brewery, for which it appears he was little adapted, the enterprise proving a failure. He was a man of optimistic nature; undemonstratively but deeply religious; patriotic, often referring with pride to the fact that he was one of the Volunteers of 1782; and not without a share of the national gift of humor.

But, as so often happens, Gerald Griffin owed more to mother than to father. His mother was a sister of a distinguished Limerick physician, and a woman of culture and refinement, with a marked fondness for literature, which she indulged with sound taste and judgment. The influence of such a mother on a child of the temperament of Gerald Griffin can be more easily imagined than described. There is not a line that he ever wrote that does not reflect it. Among his papers was found after his death a manuscript copy of "The Deserted Village," in his mother's handwriting, bearing at the foot of the last page her comment, "An invaluable treasure." It is evident that from his childhood she had seen in him a something which picked him out from his fellows and which she sedulously sought to foster.

The family was a numerous one, consisting of nine sons (of whom Gerald was the youngest) and four daughters. It made up a household about which we read with more than ordinary interest and which, in some of its characteristics, recalls that middleman's family (the Dalys) whose enduring acquaintance all readers of Griffin must have made in "The Collegians," for the description there of the home life of the Munster middleman might, in its general lines, apply to the author's own family before its members were scattered by the winds of change and time. They were a singularly united and affectionate family, and life, for them, seemed happier than the average Irish life—too bright, indeed, to last long.

When our subject was a child of seven the family removed to the country—to a delightful spot on the Shannon some twenty-eight miles from Limerick. Here his boyhood was spent, amid scenery which made an ineffaceable impression on his memory, for many a descriptive passage from his pen is reminiscent of its charms. The place was called "Fairy Lawn." A little above it the river spreads into the dimensions of a lake, separating the two shores by

a magnificent flood and presenting a spectacle which evoked from the author of "The Faery Queen" a graceful reference in the line:

The spacious Shenan, spreading like a sea."

Of the scene in question, dear to every member of the Griffin family, and especially so to him who has depicted it with the power of a master, we have an exquisite description in the third chapter of "The Collegians," where we are told amid what surroundings the Munster farmer sat down to breakfast and in what wise he conducted that agreeable function.

After a few years' private tuition Gerald was sent at the age of eleven to a classical school in Limerick, where he evinced such a fondness for Virgil, Ovid and Horace—particularly the first named—that his lessons are said "to have lost all the character of a school-boy's task." His stay here, however, was brief, for on the opening of a school at Loughill, in the immediate neighborhood of Fairy Lawn, he became a pupil there. In this rural academy, which was conducted by a young man named Donovan from the classical "Kingdom of Kerry," the author of "The Rivals" received that impression of a country school which is so vividly reproduced in that work, although we are assured that the prototype was a young man of respectable educational attainments, who would himself have been as much diverted by the sketch in question as any other reader. Of his skill as a prosodist, however, an odd anecdote is related. "Mr. Donovan," asked a pupil one day, "how ought a person to pronounce the letter 'i' in reading Latin?" "If you intend to become a priest, Dick," answered the teacher, "you may as well call it 'ee,' for I observe the clergy pronounce it in that manner; but if not, you may call it 'ee' or 'i' just as you fancy." Whatever may have been the effect of such a reply on the class generally, there was one pupil who was excessively amused at it, and that was young Gerald Griffin, who, in the course of his studies in Limerick, had never heard of such conditional pronunciation.

His favorite amusements at this period were fishing and shooting, though not for big game, his prowess in both being limited by the primitive character of his appliances. His fondness for fishing led to many delightful rambles, the memory of which is reflected with inimitable charm in his writings. Near the stream wherein he angled, on a small patch of green in a secluded glen, "and close by a huge cliff, stood the parish chapel, a small cruciform thatched building, in which Mr. Donovan on week-days was permitted to hold his school."

To this well-remembered spot Griffin paid a tender tribute in a verse preface to one of his earliest books ("Tales of the Munster Festivals"), localizing it with touching vividness in the lines:

The clift-bound Inch, the chapel in the glen,
 Where oft with bare and reverent locks we stood,
 To hear th' Eternal truths; the small dark maze
 Of the wild stream that clipp'd the blossom'd plain,
 And tolling through the varied solitude,
 Uprais'd its hundred silver tongues and babbled praise.

Although our subject's early environment may not have been favorable to the acquisition of purely academic knowledge, it was nevertheless congenial to that love for literature which early made its appearance in him and grew with his growth. "It evinced itself at this time," says his biographer, "by his generally sitting to his breakfast or tea with a book before him, which he was reading, two or three under his arm and a few more on the chair behind him. This was often a source of amusement to the rest of the family. He had a secret drawer in which he kept his papers, and it was whispered that he wrote scraps and put them there; but he was such a little fellow then that it was thought to be in imitation of one of his elder brothers, who had a strong taste for poetry. . . . He had made a blank book, and many of his hours of recreation were occupied in copying pieces of poetry into it."

In the year 1817 his eldest brother, who held a commission in the army, returned after an absence of some years spent in Canada with his regiment. Being much impressed with the new country as a field for settlers and appreciating the difficulties with which the family at home had to struggle, he urged them to emigrate. The suggestion, which did not at first meet with favor, was some three years later adopted in part, the parents and majority of the children crossing the Atlantic and finding, further south than was originally intended, a home in a beautiful district of country in the State of Pennsylvania. Gerald was not among the exiles, but he felt the separation none the less keenly.

About this time one of his brothers took up the practice of his profession—that of medicine—at Adare, a village some ten miles distant from Limerick, and thither the rest of the diminished household at Fairy Lawn removed with him. This was William Griffin, "whose affectionate care," to quote the words of the dedication to him of his famous brother's biography, "fostered that talent in his younger brother from which the public has derived such solid pleasure."

Gerald had now reached an age (17) when the question of a profession pressed itself into notice. Two of his brothers having already chosen medicine, it was felt that he would follow their example. For a time he studied with that end in view. Of his brief experience in this connection a curious anecdote is related. In the absence of Dr. Griffin, he was once asked to attend a man who had rather seriously hurt his knee. Among those whom

curiosity or sympathy had drawn to the house of the patient was one of those empirics known as "bone setters," who by that air of superior wisdom which they could so readily assume, coupled with a style of speech more pompous than lucid, gained such an influence among the peasantry a generation or two ago. Gerald's examination of the injured limb was jealously and closely watched by this worthy, who on its completion turned to the diffident young student, and in a manner intended to awe him as well as those present, asked: "Pray, sir, do you think the patella is fractured?" "I was puzzled," said Gerald afterwards when telling the story, "to think what answer I should give him, for I did not so much as know what the patella was. I kept looking at the limb, all the while engaged in trying to keep my countenance. At length I said as gravely as I could, and with perfect truth, 'I do not know that it is,' with which he seemed satisfied, so I recommended some soothing applications and got out of the house as quickly as I could to avoid any more of his learned questions."

In the Adare home the quiet current of family life, checkered only by the shadow of emigration, gradually resumed its even tenor. There, as at Fairy Lawn, the development of Griffin's literary powers was helped by his environment, which in his works we find reflected in fond memory, as in the well-known quatrain:

Oh, sweet Adare! Oh, lovely vale!
Oh, pleasant haunt of sylvan splendor,
Nor summer sun, nor morning gale,
E'er hailed a scene more softly tender.

The place to which this graceful apostrophe was addressed is picturesquely situated on the banks of a small stream called the Mague. In the immediate vicinity is the seat of the Earl of Dunraven, the central object of one of the noblest manorial parks in the country. Here pastoral and sylvan scenery spread before the eye of the future poet and novelist a wealth of natural charm difficult anywhere to match, whilst monastic and feudal ruins spoke to him of a past which his imagination was some day to illumine and make real to his readers. "Gerald," says his biographer, "took the greatest delight in wandering with his sisters through these sweet scenes, stealing sometimes at dusk or evening through the dim cloisters of the abbey and calling to mind the time when religion held her undisturbed abode there; when the bell tolled for morning prayer or the vesper hymn, or the sounds of war or revelry were heard in startling contrast from the adjacent castle. All these ruins, particularly the religious ones, affected him with a warm and reverent enthusiasm."

To such influences may be ascribed the birth of that project—a series of novels illustrative of certain epochs of Irish history, of

which, however, but one example from his pen has been given us. This was "The Invasion," the forerunner, if not the impulse of more than one historical novel by other hands.

Adare possessed the further advantage of easy access to Limerick, where a youth of studious habits and literary aspirations could consult suitable works and meet persons of congenial tastes. Thus our subject met John Banim, at this time an occasional visitor to the "City of the Violated Treaty." They became acquainted through a dramatic society of which the young Adare student was one of the founders, and on the performances of which Banim had written some critiques in the local press.

It was about this period that Griffin made his first appearance in print, the occasion being a series of articles contributed to a local paper which led to a short-lived engagement. He appears to have been an extensive reader, with a marked partiality for imaginative literature, and to have acquired a taste which, directed in youth along the proper channels, found in the course of his reading satisfaction only in the pure and noble. Having now given up definitely all notion of the medical profession, he devoted himself principally to a systematic study of dramatic poetry, which appears to have been his first literary preference. That he was also absorbed in some task of authorship is certain, yet Dr. Griffin was surprised one morning when Gerald placed in his hands the result of this special work, which was a tragedy under the title of "Aguire," with a request that he read it, and the intimation that he had formed the purpose of trying his fortune in London. As the production of one who had scarcely emerged from boyhood, the play, which was suggested by a Spanish story, profoundly impressed his brother, as it did later no less a judge of dramatic excellence than John Banim himself. It was soon followed by two others, as to which, however, nothing has definitely been recorded. But the proposal to leave home was another matter. Considering Gerald's youth, inexperience and temperament, also the Quixotic nature of his intention of entering upon his literary career in London as a playwright with a view, as he himself puts it, "to revolutionizing the dramatic taste of the time," life for him in a vast and strange city, without a friend to look to for counsel or aid, seemed to his brother to be fraught with danger. It was natural, therefore, that Dr. Griffin, who since the emigration of the heads of the family had filled their place towards his youngest brother with unflinching care and devotion, should, as he did, hesitate for some time about giving his consent to such a step. On the other hand, he realized that in the writings submitted to him there was a power that must one day compel recognition, and eventually this view of the case prevailed.

Just then the family moved to Pallas Kenry, some six miles away, Dr. Griffin being induced thereto by the prospect of an improved practice, and Gerald postponed his departure for London until they had settled in their new home. From here in the autumn of 1823, before he had completed his twentieth year, he went forth to see what fortune held for him in life's lottery.

He was not long in the big strange city of London before the day dreams formed on the banks of the Shannon faded at touch of the stern realities of experience. The story of his early struggles in the British metropolis makes interesting, though painful, reading. Of them in a letter to his parents, dated October 12, 1825, two years after he had left home, he says, among other things: "I have not had since I left Ireland a single moment's peace of mind—constantly running backward and forward and trying a thousand expedients, and only to meet disappointments everywhere I turned. . . . When first I came to London my own self-conceit, backed by the opinion of one of the most original geniuses of the age, induced me to set about revolutionizing the dramatic taste of the time by writing for the stage. Indeed the design was formed and the first step taken (a couple of pieces written) in Ireland. I cannot with my present experience conceive anything more comical than my own views and measures at the time. A young gentleman totally unknown even to a single family in London, coming into town with a few pounds in one pocket and a brace of tragedies in the other, supposing that the one will set him up before the others are exhausted, is not a very novel, but a very laughable delusion."

Describing his repeated failures to get any of his plays accepted, he admits ruefully that he was forced by sheer necessity to give up dramatic writing altogether and seek in other directions, not fame, but even a bare livelihood. "It was then," he proceeds, "I set about writing for the weekly publications, all of which, except the *Literary Gazette*, cheated me abominably. Then . . . I wrote for the great magazines. My articles were generally inserted, but on calling for payment, seeing that I was a poor, inexperienced devil, there was so much shuffling and shabby work that it disgusted me and I gave up the idea of making money that way. I now lost heart for everything; got into the cheapest lodgings I could make out, and there worked on, rather to divert my mind from the horrible gloom that I felt growing on me in spite of myself than with any hope of being remunerated."

Although his quest for employment was kept up, he could find practically nothing to do. How desperate and urgent was his condition may be gathered from the almost incredible fact that for two guineas he translated a volume and a half of Prevot's works.

"My dear Dan," he says in a letter to his biographer, commenting upon the feat, "tell this not in Gath; publish it not in the streets of Askalon."

Singularly enough, as his needs grew in urgency, his sensitiveness with respect to them and his self-dependence increased to an almost morbid degree, hedging him round with a barrier of reserve that neither kindness nor sympathy could pierce. This was his condition when John Banim sought to succor him, but found himself repulsed. Banim, it appears, had twice gone to see him at his lodgings, which were now "a small room in some obscure court near St. Paul's," and not finding him in on either occasion had questioned the landlady as to his circumstances, only to learn that her lodger more than once had left himself without the necessities of life. "He appeared to be despondent," she added, "dressed but indifferently, shut himself up for whole days together in his room without sending her for any provision, and when he went out it was only at nightfall, when he was likely to meet no one that he knew."

Shocked at what he had heard, Banim left a note for his distressed friend, delicately but cordially offering help, which, as has already been said, was refused—an action on Griffin's part which can be explained only by his extremely sensitive nature, touched to the quick by the casual disclosure (even to such a friend as Banim) of his straits. It led to an estrangement between them, one, however, not of long standing and which required but a word of explanation to remove.

It must surely have been one of life's ironies that in this, the darkest hour of his fortunes, Griffin's genius should have flowered in "Gisippus," written about this time, but destined not to receive the honor of public presentation during his lifetime, it not having been put on the boards until 1842, two years after the grave had closed over its author. It may be said in passing that this play was one of those specially selected by Macready in that eminent actor's attempt to restore the classical drama, and that on its first presentation he filled the leading rôle. But so far as winning bread for Griffin or helping him to a competence was concerned this dramatic achievement availed him naught.

When failure had all but crushed him chance, or rather Providence, interposed. A friend whom he had not seen for an unusually long interval dropped in to see him. Amazed as well as pained at what he saw, more especially as Griffin himself did not appear to realize the gravity of his own condition, this friend frightened the half-starved author by blurting out that he looked like a ghost—a salutary burst of candor for Griffin, as it opened his eyes to his

plight. His visitor, without informing him of his intention, went straightway to Dr. Maginn, whom he acquainted with what he had just witnessed. Now under a rather gruff exterior the famous Corkonian hid a kindly heart, which was deeply touched at this tale of distress—one, too, concerning a fellow-countryman—and with him to feel was to act. The result for Griffin was an engagement on the *Literary Gazette*, which proved to be the turning point in his career. It not only relieved him from his immediate embarrassments, but it also enabled him to win a self-supporting position, for although the remuneration was not in itself a competence, it nevertheless gave him a sense of security. Moreover, the work involved, which took up only a portion of each day, left him considerable leisure for other literary undertakings. The tide had at last turned. Before long he could get all the work he wanted, and, what was more to the purpose at this particular juncture, prompt payment therefor. He could also look beyond the rut of his daily labor at possibilities of greater things, for thus far he could not help feeling that he was but a literary hack. Let us glance for a moment at the prospect before him.

The time was the close of the first quarter of the last century. Catholic emancipation had not yet come. Ireland herself still lay in the shadow of the penal period. As to imaginative literature, at any rate, her position in English letters was not conspicuous. Swift, Burke, Goldsmith, Moore—to mention the names that loom largest in the survey—had, it is true, won a commanding place from which time has not dislodged them. But none of these had left a picture of Irish life which might be pointed to as a standard presentment of a type or of a characteristic “racy of the soil.” Of the four Goldsmith may be said to have been the only novelist; but what we have from him as such, precious though it be, reveals in regard to Ireland an entire absence of national color. Maria Edgeworth, then, was the most notable pioneer in the field that Griffin entered as she was about to quit it. But even she has not the hold on the reader that Griffin has. John Banim, it is true, in collaboration with his brother, was coming into notice as a writer of fiction in a way which soon eclipsed his fame as a dramatist. Yet here again the best does not rise to Griffin’s level. The same may be said of Carleton, with, however, this qualification, that he had “sold his birthright for a mess of pottage,” having accepted a position wherein caricature, rather than delineation of his own folk opened for him a lucrative if not honorable career. Yet it is but fair to add that he lived to make amends, bridging thus the chasm between “The Stations” and that noblest emanation of his genius, “The Poor Scholar.”

Then there were writers who had stooped to a marketable conception and treatment of Irish character, finding in the novel and periodical of the day profitable and congenial employment for their pens. It was a time when a writer of Griffin's power might have rapidly made a fortune.

This, as respects the national novel, was our subject's literary heritage. But, to his everlasting credit be it said, when it came to a question between lucre and principle, he remained loyal to his conscience and to his art.

Though his work as a magazine writer and reviewer kept him busy, he nevertheless realized that he was but groping in the dark for his proper place. Light came to him presently in an offer from his good friend Banim, who asked him to contribute a story to a further series of the "Tales by the O'Hara Family." Although this invitation (prompted obviously by the most considerate kindness and implying faith in Griffin's ability) was declined, it yet confirmed his own belief that in the field to which it pointed lay the fairest promise for his labors. Thither, therefore, he began to feel his way. The first intimation we get of his progress is in a letter to his future biographer, in which he says that he was working up his recollections for a volume which, under the title of "Munster Anecdotes," was to consist of short stories illustrative of the manners and scenery of the south of Ireland. "Could you," he asks his brother, "send me some materials for a few short tales, laying the scene about the sea coast—Kilkee?"

When in the autumn of the year 1826 Dr. Griffin paid him a visit, he "found him occupying neatly furnished apartments in Northumberland street, Regent's Park." Not having seen Gerald since the latter had left Ireland, three years before, and knowing but little of the ordeal through which he had passed, he was startled at the physical change in his appearance. "All color," Dr. Griffin writes, "had left his cheek; he had grown very thin, and there was a sedate expression of countenance unusual in one so young and which in after years became habitual to him. It was far from being so, however, at the time I speak of, and readily gave place to that light and lively glance of his dark eye, that cheerfulness of manner and observant humor which from his very infancy had enlivened our fireside circle at home. Although so pale and thin as I have described him, his tall figure, expressive features and his profusion of dark hair, thrown back from a fine forehead, gave an impression of a person remarkably handsome and interesting." This, in personal appearance, was Gerald Griffin at the age of twenty-two.

His brother found him immersed in his literary engagements.

Besides his work for the magazines and on his contemplated book, he had in a short time written two or three operas, as well as part of a new comedy, which we are told was a charming production "in easy blank verse," bearing a marked resemblance to the old comedies. It was, however, never completed, for on Dr. Griffin's casually observing, as he read a certain passage of it: "Why, Gerald, this scene is in 'The Black Dwarf,'" the sensitive author, who, by the way, had never read that story of Scott's, obtained a copy from a neighboring library only to find the coincidence in question (for such, of course, it was), whereupon he flung his composition aside and could never be prevailed upon to finish it. Another instance of his unconquerable aversion to anything that savored of plagiarism, which he appears to have held in as deep contempt as he had held patronage in the days of his sharpest struggle, occurred during his brother's visit. This was when he was giving the last touches to a word picture of Shrovetide for a series of stories on which he happened to be engaged, and a copy of "Peter of the Castle," then just published, was placed in his hands. Eager to see his friend Banim's new book, he dropped his pen and, glancing at the first chapter of the volume, discovered to his chagrin and amazement a description of the very festival of which at the very moment he himself was busy with a sketch. "He at once," says Dr. Griffin, "tore out the latter from his tale."

"Holland-tide" was, at length, submitted to the publishers and immediately accepted. Whilst the sum paid for the copyright (£70) was not large, the transaction meant much for a young and as yet comparatively unknown writer and afforded Griffin the opportunity of a visit to Ireland and taking a needed rest.

During this visit, which extended from February to August of the year 1827, he wrote the first series of "Tales of the Munster Festivals," in three volumes, including "Card Drawing," "The Half Sir" and "Suil Dhuv." This work, to which the idea of supplying a description of certain festivals observed by the Munster peasantry had given birth, stamped the author as one of the greatest delineators of national manners and customs that Ireland had yet produced. Its keynote is aptly struck in the stanzas "Old Times, Old Times," serving as a preface to one of the stories. Although pointing out some blemishes, attributable to haste and excessive eagerness, the reviewers pronounced favorably on the work, which won immediate, wide and lasting favor.

But Griffin was exceedingly sensitive to anything in the nature of criticism, and this touch of it made him so self-exacting in regard to his next book that a whole year had passed in unsatisfactory and discarded attempts on a variety of subjects before any real

progress had been made with it. Once fairly started, however, the composition proceeded at a marvelously rapid rate. This, which appeared in 1828, was "The Collegians," his masterpiece. Having prematurely arranged for its publication, the printers overtook him long before its completion, with the result that for the rest of the work it was a race between them. When it is remembered that that part of this great novel in which occur its most dramatic scenes and the climax of its interest was written at fever heat, to the cry each morning from the printer of "more copy," there must be conceded to its author an imagination overflowing with his subject and a gift of expression to match it. "The Collegians," as Griffin himself once said, "was a story that wrote itself." In some of the passages the early dramatic passion used to flash out. "What a great deal I would give," said he to his biographer, who was with him at the time the passage in question was written, "to see Edmund Kean in that scene of Hardress Cregan at the party, just before his arrest, where he is endeavoring to do politeness to the ladies while the horrid warning voice is in his ear. The very movements of Kean's countenance in such a scene as that would make one's nerves creep."

Griffin's fame rests principally on "The Collegians," in which we have the finest work ever achieved by an Irish novelist. In description, in plot, in treatment of character, in moral quality and depth and in that consummate union of pathos and humor which marks the master, there are of its kind few, if any, novels to surpass it. The impression produced on its appearance three quarters of a century ago has only deepened with time. The *Dublin University Magazine*, among the first to greet it, closed an appreciation, which has never been questioned, with these words: "'The Collegians' is equal in interest and superior in its fidelity to nature to any Irish novel with which we are acquainted."

At the age of twenty-five Gerald Griffin had become famous. Yet at this moment of splendid achievement, instead of proceeding to add to it, he hesitates, offering no reason except his desire to study for some profession that would make him independent of a fickle reading public. With this object in view, he entered as a law student at the London University; but, like medicine at an earlier age, legal science does not appear to have had any lasting attraction for him. We next find him absorbed in a study of Irish history and antiquities and writing Dr. Griffin about it in terms of characteristic ardor. "I am full of my next tale," he says, "quite enthusiastic—in love with my subject and up to my ears in antiquities at the London institution. A novel full of curious and characteristic traits of ancient Irish life is my object." The outcome

of this study was "The Invasion," of which Thomas Davis has said : "There are in it most exquisite beauty of scene and form, the purest loveliness, the most original heroism of any work we own, and it contains besides invaluable and countless hints on the appearance of ancient Ireland."

His aim being to give as complete and trustworthy a picture of the remote period involved (the eighth century), he made the most exhaustive researches in London and Dublin, which explains the delay in the progress of the work, which was not published until 1832. Meanwhile he had written a further series of the "Munster Festivals," also "The Rivals," "The Christian Physiologist; or, Tales of the Five Senses," "The Duke of Monmouth" and "Tales of My Neighborhood." Though unequal to "The Collegians" in popularity, they yet showed no wane in literary power.

Most of those volumes were written in Ireland, where he made his brother's home, at Pallas Kenry, the centre of his movements. Killarney and the west coast of Clare during this time were frequently visited, and with the latter are associated two fine examples of his verse—"O! Brazil, the Isle of the Blest," and the "Ode to a Sea Gull Seen Off the Cliffs of Moher." Wherever he went in his native land he would have been made much of had he not eschewed social attentions. His self-exclusion, however, did not prevent his fellow-townsmen in 1832 from selecting him as their envoy to Thomas Moore, whom they were anxious to have stand for Limerick in a Parliamentary contest then pending. Although the mission was a failure, the poet declaring that his engagements precluded an acceptance of the honor, it yet gave Griffin an opportunity which he had long desired of meeting Moore, who received him on the occasion with the utmost cordiality and showed by his manner that the fame of his visitor had preceded him at Sloperton.

As to Griffin's power and work as a poet a word may not be out of place. That he had not only "the vision and faculty divine" no one who has read "A Place in Thy Memory" or "Gille Machree," to cite but two of his songs, can deny. Than the former we have authority for saying that there is no lovelier lyric in the English language, whilst of the latter Thomas Davis has declared that it ranks among the finest examples of the ballad in any tongue. Gavan Duffy has referred to this little gem as "striking on the heart like the cry of a woman." "Poetry," writes Edward Hayes in his introductory essay on "The Ballad Poetry of Ireland," "was his (Griffin's) first and greatest inspiration, and if his natural bent had been properly encouraged he would probably have been the greatest of Irish poets."

His blank verse, as in "Gisippus," has been pronounced graceful.

easy and natural, rhythm, diction and thought meeting throughout the fundamental demands of poetry.

As to the narrative ballad we have one superb specimen of his skill in "Orange and Green," that subtle, irresistible appeal of his for tolerance, made in the guise of a simple, heart-reaching story. Had he never written another line than that little ballad he would have earned the everlasting gratitude of all Irishmen.

What Griffin might have done in the field of poetry had he continued therein we can only conjecture. We know that he himself had held lofty ideals in that direction and had made some progress towards their realization; but they fell to the ground when that altered view in regard to his career as a man of letters became a compelling conviction.

At the very zenith of his fame we begin to discern signs of this change—in doubts expressed to friends as to the moral tendency of certain of his earlier novels; in his later writings, which become more and more didactic in tone and "show," as his biographer points out, "the almost complete absence of any dark traits of passion;" in the utterance of such sentiments as those of that beautiful poem, "The Sister of Charity," and in his growing desire to consecrate himself wholly to the service of religion. Passages in a letter to his father, written as early as 1833, go to the heart of the matter. "There is one subject," he then writes, "which I wish no longer to defer speaking about. I mean the desire which I have for a long time entertained of taking orders in the Church. God only knows whether I may ever live to carry the wish into execution. . . . My time," he continues, "is divided between my college course of study and my usual pursuits. . . . To say nothing of the arguments of faith, I do not know any station in life in which a man can do so much good, both to others and himself, as in that of a Catholic priest. . . . To say," he moralizes, "that Gerald, the novel writer, is by the grace of God really satisfied to lay aside forever all hope of that fame for which he was once sacrificing health, repose and pleasure, and to offer himself as a laborer in the vineyard of Jesus Christ; that literary reputation has become a worthless trifle to him, to whom it once was almost all, and that he feels a happiness in the thought of giving all to God—is such a merciful favor that all the fame and riches in the world dwindle into nothing at the thought of it." Comment on sentiments such as these, worthy of a St. Ignatius Loyola or a St. Francis de Sales, is superfluous.

His last visit to London, which was to make arrangements for the publication of his works, was in 1835. Three years later he went with his brother, Dr. Daniel Griffin, on a trip to Scotland,

which he seems thoroughly to have enjoyed and of which he has left some interesting impressions. Although he afterwards resumed at Pallas Kenry the quiet, methodic mode of life, which had now become habitual with him and there was no apparent change in his views respecting a religious vocation, he had nevertheless altered his attention of becoming a priest, for in the month of August, 1838, he announced his final purpose—that of becoming a member of the Society of Christian Brothers, which a generation earlier had been introduced into Ireland by Edmund Ignatius Rice, of Waterford, with results that made the recent celebration of the centenary of that event an expression of national gratitude and rejoicing. There was something in the society that appealed to Gerald Griffin with peculiar force. Its retirement from the world, as complete as that of any of the monastic orders, and, above all, its unselfish and noble object—the Christian education of youth—fell in with his own thoughts and ideals. On the 8th of September of the same year he entered the novitiate of the order in Dublin.

An incident, which shows how utterly he had separated himself from the world, occurred a few evenings before his departure. This was the destruction of his unpublished manuscripts, of which there was a considerable mass, lest there should be anything in them that might wound the moral susceptibilities of any reader. Extraordinary as may seem this proceeding in regard to works which, we are assured, were of real literary value and which as to their moral tone might, it is safe to assume, be classified with Griffin's published writings, of which Cardinal Gibbons has said that nowhere in them "can we find any word or insinuation that could bring a blush to the most delicate cheek or a twinge to the tenderest conscience," still when we consider of what kind their author was in a question of principle, the action is not inconsistent with his character.

Those who may think that Gerald Griffin left the world for the cloister because of disappointment in his literary career have simply failed either to understand the grandeur of the motives that actuated him or to appreciate the peace of mind and happiness he won from that step. Referring to his experience in a letter to a London friend, written in his second year as a religious from the North Monastery, Cork, whither he had been transferred from Dublin, he says: "I was ordered off here from Dublin last June, and have been since enlightening the craniums of the wondering Paddies in this quarter, who learn from me with profound amazement and profit that o-x spells ox; that the top of a map is the north and the bottom the south, with various other 'branches;' as also that they ought to be good boys and do as they are bid and say their prayers every

morning and evening, etc., and yet it seems curious even to myself that I feel a great deal happier in the practice of this routine than I did while I was roving about your great city absorbed in the modest project of rivaling Shakespeare and throwing Scott into the shade."

His obedience to rule, his humility and gentleness, the charm of his conversation caused him not only to be respected but beloved by both his superior and religious confrères. At first, and indeed for a considerable time, he could not be brought to think of resuming his literary labors; and the head of the community wisely refrained from even suggesting it, however ardently he hoped that such talents should not lie fallow.

"During the whole time he was with us," relates one of the Brothers, "I never heard him even once speak of his writings except in private conversation with myself, and then only when I introduced the subject. He was desirous of living unknown; of placing himself on a level in every respect with those immediately around him. . . . On one occasion we were speaking in community of the County of Wicklow and its scenery, when some one present said: 'You have been in the County of Wicklow?' He simply replied that he had. Judge my astonishment when a few days after I met for the first time his 'Reflections on Visiting the Seven Churches.' On another occasion some allusion was made to Ullah (alluding, I believe, to his 'Voluptuary Cured'). He blushed like a child. He was sensibly affected by the least word said in his praise, and avoided everything that could directly or indirectly excite it. . . . He once told me," adds this Brother of his in religion, "that from the moment he got a decidedly serious turn he never could bring himself to the temperament necessary for works of fiction."

His superior's tact, however, in leaving to time the passing away of this indifference to literary occupation was rewarded, for with the gradual diminution of this feeling there came back in a chastened, though unimpaired, form the old passion for writing. A series of tales of a religious character was undertaken, which within its range does not suffer by comparison with his best work. Thus side by side with a piety which was as profound as it was unaffected, and with a scrupulous yet cheerful conformity to monastic routine, there sprang forth that second growth of literary power which, had life been vouchsafed him, might have rivaled the first.

What a spectacle! What an example! Search the history of literature as you may, and you will find it hard, if not impossible, to match it. Think of what it means: A writer of fame, still in his intellectual prime and with the most alluring prospects before

him, relinquishing all for the humble and obscure life of a Christian Brother, and then consecrating his brilliant gifts to the service of religion with an energy and a devotion worthy of his most strenuous day.

His life as a religious was destined to be short. His health, which had never quite thrown off the effects of that terrible ordeal in London, began in the spring of 1840 to show symptoms of an old trouble, an affection of the heart, which any attack of other illness almost invariably induced. On Sunday, the last day of May, he contracted a cold which brought on a fatal illness, death, which he met with the fortitude and resignation of a saint, calling him in the early morning of Friday, 12th of June, at the early age of thirty-six.

But a few days before he had been throwing all his energy into the composition of "Holy Island," the last story to engage his pen. He had just commenced a sentence opening with the words: "Of the things of this world, my son, they are well informed, but as for that abyss beyond—" when the dinner bell of the monastery rang; and with the trained obedience of the religious he laid down his pen. It was for the last time.

"In personal appearance," says his biographer, "he was tall and well formed, and though rather slender possessed considerable strength. . . . He was a person of rather quick temper, much more so, indeed, than one would readily be brought to believe from ordinary intercourse with him. His usual demeanor, however, was that of mildness and gentleness; and even on these occasions when the influence of his natural temperament seemed about to appear he showed a degree of self-possession which prevented it from giving him any serious disturbance."

The conclusion forced upon one who has read Gerald Griffin's works and given any attention to the story of his life is that in him literature has been honored and the annals of his native country enriched. Than he no literary worker has ever been moved by nobler impulses or striven after purer ideals. His place in the world of letters, had he remained in it, would doubtless have been more considerable than it is, but it could not have left a more honorable memory. The land of his nativity must ever hold him in proud and fond remembrance. He has portrayed her people, illuminated her history, depicted her scenery with a pen that has never been surpassed and crowned all by the example of his life. With a more extended literary career, indeed, he might as a national novelist have rivaled Scott in the volume as he did in the quality of his work. But it is questionable whether his country or fellow-countrymen would have been more closely and tenderly

drawn to him than they are. Told by years, his life was short; but by deeds and experience, long. Exposed at the most susceptible period of life to the dangers of a great and strange city, without friend or guide and sometimes penniless, he stood a test to which so many have proved unequal. When he went forth on his quest for fame he bore with him a pure and undimmed faith. When he returned, wearied with the struggle and disappointed with the hard-won prize, he brought back that faith untarnished, sealing his devotion to it by consecrating to its service the years of his intellectual prime.

Taken all in all, then, he has left in his work a precious inheritance and in his life an inspiring example. On her bead-roll of fame Ireland counts many names, distinguished in various departments of human thought and endeavor, which she cherishes and venerates, but to none of her great ones can her heart go out with a fuller measure of love and admiration than to the "gentle, gifted" Gerald Griffin.

E. P. STANTON.

Ottawa, Canada.

A MEDIÆVAL MEDLEY.

THOSE who are conversant with the poetry of the Middle Ages do not find it hard to understand that England, now a stronghold of Protestantism, was once called the Dowry of Mary because of her devotion to our Blessed Lady, for all the best, all the most beautiful, all the most passionate poetry from the twelfth to the fifteenth centuries was either addressed to her or to Our Divine Lord, and dealt mostly with His Passion and the grief it caused to His Mother. All the best love songs were addressed to Jesus or Mary, for if our ancestors were ignorant of many things we know, they knew what we too often forget, that the supreme love of all loves is the love of Jesus, the most real romance, the story of a vocation.

It is not, however, with this branch of mediæval poetry that we intend to deal here, but with a less intimate and less devotional kind, from which, incidentally, many curious facts as to the manners and customs of our ancestors may be gathered and many quaint legends and forgotten traditions brought to memory.

The original source from which the learned editor for the Early English Text Society drew the materials of the poems examined here is a thick quarto volume in the Lambeth Palace Library, containing among other treasures the MS. copy of a song called "Ye Develis

Parlament," or the "Parlamentum of Feendes." This poem was first printed in London by Wynkyn de Worde in 1509, and in 1877 was published by the Early English Text Society.

The colophon to Wynkyn de Worde's edition runs as follows: "Thus endeth the parlyament of devylls. Emprynted by Wynkyn de Worde, prynter unto the most excellent princess my lady the kynges moder. The year of our Lord M. CCCCC. & IX."

Henry VIII. of impious memory came to the throne in 1509, but it was not to his mother, Elizabeth of Yorke, who was not a literary woman, but to his grandmother, Margaret Beaufort, daughter of the Duke of Somerset and heiress of John of Gaunt, that Wynkyn de Worde was printer. This "most excellent princess" founded the divinity professorships called after her at Oxford and Cambridge, and finished Christ Church College, begun by Henry VI., at the suggestion of her confessor, John Fisher. She was a patroness first of Caxton and afterwards of Wynkyn de Worde; she translated part of the "Imitation of Christ" from Latin to English, and other books of devotion from the French. She was a most devout woman, and though she did not enter religion, she lived under vows in the world, leading a very strict and pious life. She died in the same year as her husband, Henry VII., in 1509.

"The Parliament of Devils," printed that same year by de Worde, consists of forty-three stanzas, each stanza containing eight octosyllabic or very often longer lines, rhyming alternately. The genius of the anonymous author showed itself more in his rhymes, which are very true, than in his metre, for he was by no means particular as to the number of feet in a line.

We have no clue at all to the identity of the author, who like so many more of these mediæval poets, must forever remain unknown to us; but whoever he was, he had considerable dramatic power, as will appear in the quotations we shall give, and also a gift for character drawing, even of devils.

The poem opens by describing how, when Our Lord was born, all the devils of the earth, of the air and of hell held a parliament to consider who was His Father, and the impudence with which they discuss the question is finely depicted. Some of them declared they did not know who His Father was, but they had heard through the prophets that God had made a covenant with man, and that His Son should become man and suffer death. Then in the following lines, slightly altered and the spelling modernized, as we have done in all the quotations to make them clearer, the devils complain:

These prophets spoke so in mist;
What they meant we never knew.
They spoke of One should be called Christ,
But Mary's Son is called Jesu.

The prophets also said Christ should be One with God, but "Jesus never in the Godhead grew," so the devils declare that with all their wisdom they are puzzled, and "the cloth is all of another hue." They agreed that if God's Son became man they would claim Him as their own, and then the master devil undertakes the task of tempting and winning Him, as soon as He is ripe.

To me, master devil, it lies;
To Jesus will I take heed,
To nourish Him in many delights (delices),
His frail flesh to clothe and feed;
And though that He be never so wise,
Yet out of the way I will Him lead,
And make of Him both fool and zull (nyce)
And in hell His soul breed.

For thirty years the fiends in vain lay snares for Him. At last, when He goes into the wilderness, the master devil passes there with Him and relates his experiences in the next stanzas. He wonders at Our Lord's constitution, that He could live for forty days on prayer alone and abstain entirely from food; but when he tempted Him to turn the stones into bread He refused.

Upon a high pinnacle then I Him brought,
And left Him there, and I leapt down
And said, "Save Thee harmless limb and head,
And show Thyself Master while Thou'st young.
If Thou be God's Son, let us see.
Of Thee is written long ago
Angels in their hands shall bear Thee,
Lest Thou spurn Thy foot against a stone."
Quoth Jesu, "In holy writ thou mayst see,
"Tempt not thy Lord God living alone;
With all thy might and thy power (pooste)
Thou shalt Him serve and other none."

Seeing he could not prevail, the devil then takes our Lord to the top of the mountain.

And here he showed Him upon that plain
Jewels, riches and worldly bliss.
"Worship me here and become my swain,
And I shall give Thee all this."
"Go, Sathanas! from bliss thou flit;
From heaven rich, that royal tower!
It is written only in holy writ,
"Thy Lord God thou shalt honour."
"Alas!" quoth the devil, "where hast Thou that wit?"
Thy words are bitter, Thy works are sour,
Thy conclusion so sore me hit;
I bowed ne'er to so sharp a shower."

Then the devils hold another parliament in the mist, and complain that some one is coming to rifle their home and gather the flour out of their garners. New "beguilers" threaten them. At first He was called John the Baptist, then Jesus, and now Christ is His name. Then they say they never saw Him sin, and that when He was born wonders happened. In Rome a well of oil sprang up and ran from Trastevere to Tiber; temples fell down and idols broke. The Emperor of Rome saw three suns in one shining clear,

and in their midst a maiden bearing a man child in her arms; and He and the Sibyl both prophesied that the time drew near when God's Son should redeem mankind.

Also three kings came from far,
To worship Jesu all they sought;
That raised Herod's heart there
Them to slay, for they so wrought.

Then the devil counselled Herod to slay the men children that Jesus might die with them; but He escaped into Egypt, seeing Satan's guile. The devil goes on complaining to his parliament that it is no good tempting Him, "the more I so work, the worse I speed," and then comes one of the few alliterative lines in the piece:

"The bolder in bicker I bid Him battle," the less heed He takes; and if he tempts Him by the deadly sins He overthrows him with the opposite virtues. He never went to school, and yet the devil saw Him arguing with the doctors. He works so many miracles that Satan can't make out who He is.

He is so wonderful in life,
I cannot know well what He is.
I would He had ended our strife;
He is out of our books, and we out of His.

Satan then says that since he first began to tempt our Lord, he never saw Him change color, though he cannot forget that once Jesus reproved him, nor can he discover where He gained His knowledge and His miraculous powers. Then in the following stanza he describes the Transfiguration:

I followed Him once into a place,
To a mountain upon a height;
Peter, James and John there was,
Ely and Moses stood there upright.
I would have seen Jesus' face,
But I might not, it shone so bright;
In the soothfast sun closed it was,
The bright beams blinded my sight.

He then tells how he tried to hinder the prophesies of our Lord's death being fulfilled, because their fulfilment meant ruin to him and his devils, and how he set Pilate's wife to stop it. The action of the poem now becomes more dramatic after Satan has described the effect our Lord's death, which he has just witnessed, had upon him. He lost his senses, for when our Lord's side was pierced with a spear the devil recognized Him, but now he can't discover where the soul of Jesus is gone; so, lest He should come and attack hell, the devils must prepare and try to tear Him from top to toe. Obedient to their master, the devils chained up the gates and barred them in the part of hell containing the good souls. Then follow the finest stanzas in the poem and some of the most original, in their

application of the twenty-third Psalm, to the gates of hell instead of to those of heaven :

"Ah! now," said Jesu, "ye princes fell;
Open the gates that ever shall last,
And let in your king of bliss to hell."
The devils asked Him then in haste,
"Who is the king of bliss Thou dost of tell;
Weenest Thou to make us all aghast?"

"Strong God and king of might,
I am Lord and king of bliss;
Overcomer of death and mighty in fight!
Everlasting gates open wide!
Both peace, mercy, truth and right,
I bought them at once and made them kiss;
Everlasting gates open on high,
And let in your King to take out His!"

Lucifer then answers that God condemned Adam to hell forever, and as our Lord is of Adam's seed he claims Him, for there is no return from hell for any one who has once entered. Our Lord answers :

There is a bound hell, but this is free;
The bound hell was ordained for you.
For what man forfeited through a tree,
Through a tree again is he bought now.

Then He tells Lucifer that He came from the Godhead and took flesh sinlessly from a pure virgin, and when Adam sinned He made atonement for him, therefore the devil has no claim to him now. Lucifer answers that our Lord's words are in vain, for though it is certainly true that he lost heaven through his pride, yet he hopes to get there again ; but Christ tells him such words are idle. When he was in heaven he had much joy, and so had all his companions, but it soon ceased. Lucifer then replies :

In this place I have dwelt in woe and pain,
More than these four thousand years:
Help me unto that bliss again,
The which I lost for my pride here;
For there it is merry in certain
To dwell with royal angels clear.

Christ replies that He made Lucifer of nothing, and set him in heaven above all the angels, where he might still have been in rest and peace ; but when He left His seat in heaven and gave it to the devil on His return Lucifer refused to give it up, and said he was worthier to sit there and never repented of his sin. Adam, on the contrary, wept and sighed and asked for mercy and oil of grace after his fall, so the Father sent His Son to die for him, and from His side when pierced came out the "dear-worthiest" oil that ever was.

In my Father's name of heaven,
Open the gates of hell to me.

Like lightning the gates burst asunder and our Lord enters and

takes out Adam and all the elect, who join in singing a song of thanks.

"A, ha!" said Adam, "my God I see;
 He that made me with His hand!"
 "I see," said Noah, "where cometh He
 That saved me both on water and land!"
 Quoth Abraham, "I see my God so free,
 That saved my son from bitter bands!"
 Said Moses, "These tables He gave to me,
 His law to preach and understand."
 * * * * *
 * * * * *
 Our Lord then took them by the hand,
 And brought them to the place of bliss.

Thus Christ "harrowed hell" and led His lovers to Paradise, but He would not touch the other hells, where the black fiends and lost souls lie bound forever. Then all hell reproved Lucifer, charging him with cowardice; but the devil justified himself by saying how many souls of men he had brought there, even our Lord. Why were the other devils such fools as to let them go? They reply they could not help it; Christ came and took them, and Beelzebub says he barred up the gates "with locks, and chain, and bolt, and pin," but with one word of Christ's they were burst open and He came in.

He bound me and down we cast;
 It boots not us to strive with Him.
 When the dreadful doom is come and past,
 Our endless pain is then to begin.

The scene in hell closes here, and the remainder of the poem is a description of Our Lord's Resurrection and the events that followed it, up to the Assumption of our Blessed Lady. The poet assures his readers that there is no trifling in this tale, and that it is appointed to be read on the first Sunday in Lent; that it tells how Christ humbled the devil, and concludes with praying that He may help us all into heaven.

This same Lambeth MS. contains an interesting poem called "The Mirror of the Periods of Man's Life," from which we can gather some idea of the kind of life a man of good means led at the period about 1430 A. D. In the edition edited by Mr. Furnivall it is divided into stanzas of eight lines each, but in the MS. it is written without breaks. In it the virtues and vices alternately bid for the man's soul. These poems on the seven ages of man are not uncommon in mediæval poetry. Part of "Ratis Raving," written about the latter half of the fifteenth century, is taken up with an account of these ages, and both that and "The Mirror" were probably known to Shakespeare, who has summed all that was ever written on the subject up in Jacques' immortal speech beginning "All the world's a stage."

"The Mirror" opens by the poet describing a dream, in which he saw a new-born child go into a wilderness with an angel friend on one side of him and an angel foe on the other. The world came and told the child it gave him food and clothes, and asked how he would pay it. Then came strength, courage, beauty, the commandments, the pleasures of this life, its sorrows and the works of mercy, all offering to lead the poor child to heaven or hell. Free will urged it to follow it; conscience said free will will make him mad, and he must learn to know discretion, which conscience alone can teach him, and prudence, and he must beware of recklessness.

When the child, at seven years old, passes from infancy to childhood, which lasts to fourteen here, to fifteen in "Ratis Raving," the good angel teaches him to honor his parents, the wicked angel to despise them. The good angel says:

To father and mother thou honour yield;
Love God and fear and be of good virtues.
The wicked angel bade him be bold,
To call both father and mother shrews.

The word "shrew," applied by us now to a scolding woman, originally meant a wretch or a wicked person.

The good angel teaches him to be mild, and curb his tongue; the wicked angel tells him to beat other children, and mock other folks with his tongue.

When he is fourteen his childhood ceases, and then the seven virtues and the seven deadly sins fight for his soul. About the age of twenty reason advises him to go to Oxford or learn law; lust advises him to be taught the harp and "giterue" and to play with piked staff and buckler, and to make merry at taverns with wild companions and wicked women, all night till day dawns. Conscience tells him these things are waste of time and of learning, but lust laughs and the young man says:

Good conscience, go preach to the post;
Thy counsel savorueth not to my taste.
Conscience would bind me to skill,
And make me his bondman.
Farewell, conscience! Welcome freewill!
I will learn no more good than I can.

After he is "twenty winters in age" the seven deadly sins each counsel him to indulge in their special vices. Gluttony tells him to eat outrageously night and day; anger to be bold and break the head of any one who offends him; sloth to learn in youth to take his rest; covetousness to win all he can; avarice to lock it in his chest.

"Apparel thee properly," quoth Pride;
See thy pockets pass the longest gulse.
Slash thy clothes both short and wide,
Passing all other men's size."

The long pockets are probably an allusion to the "pocketing sleeves" worn in Henry IV.'s reign and also in Edward IV.'s time. The slashing of sleeves to show the shirt beneath and of other garments is shown in many old prints and satirized by Chaucer.

The seven virtues then counsel him to follow them, and conscience reproves him for his vices, but the young man refuses to listen in very spirited terms:

Thou wastest thy wind and spildest thy speech;
 Thy words to me are loth to hear.
 If I did as thou dost teach,
 I should never make merry cheer.
 Thinkest thou with thy hand heaven to reach?
 Thine arm will not be so long to yeere (certainty)
 Now, Good Conscience, and thou wilt preach,
 Go steal a habit and be a friar.

Quoth man, "I play, I wrestle, I spring;
 These joys will never turn me fro.
 I leap, I dance, I skip, I sing,
 I am so merry I cannot say ho!"
 Quoth Conscience, "Thou shalt weep and wring
 When they take their leave to go."

The young man closes this incident by calling conscience an ignorant ass.

At forty years of age man is offered all the best that the world, strength, lust, courage and health have to offer. Truth and conscience advise him to get riches in youth that will help him in age. At fifty comes a change.

Now I am fifty years I wis,
 My hair beginneth to change its hue.
 Quoth Conscience, "Flee from all vice,
 And use works of good virtue.
 Let not thy works prove thee nyce (a fool);
 Look that thou ever be found true."

The man, however, prefers covetousness and the pursuit of riches. Over-hope or presumption makes him sin. Wan-hope or despair also oppresses him. At sixty he begins to repent; his eyes are dim and his hair hoary; youth taunts him, and he is ashamed.

How shall I reckon with God Almighty?
 I am ashamed wonder sore.
 Quoth Conscience, "It were right
 To be holy now or nevermore."

Here follows one of the best verses in the poem:

"The candle of life thy soul did tend,
 To light thee home," reason did say.
 Much of my candle in waste I spent;
 Many wicked winds wasted it away.
 Scarcely I hold my candle end;
 It is past evensong of my day.
 To reap my harvest where can I wend?
 My lands of virtues all fallow lay.

The man goes on to complain that he is like a stag at bay;

he knows not where to turn, but his best way is to flee to God and cry for mercy. Now comes a fine simile in the next stanza:

When youth was master, I was page;
We lived much in the fiend's service,
With rere (late) suppers and wicked outrage;
Lay long in bed loth to arise.
Now have I nought but wishes for wage,
And much reproach among the wise.
They that loved me in youth, hated me in age,
And unkindly they did me despise.

The "rere" or late suppers, Mr. Furnivall says, were complained of in 1300 by Waddington, in 1303 by Robert of Brunne in a poem called "Handling Sin," in which servants' late suppers are denounced, and by other writers.

At seventy youth accuses him of wasting and misusing all the gifts he gave him, such as health, strength and beauty; and the old man confesses his faults and complains that youth has stolen from him, while age has stolen upon him, and says pathetically:

Now am I sixty years and ten,
Young folks I find my foe;
Whenever they play, leap or renne (run)
They think in their way I go.
And when I meet with old men,
I cry, "This world is changed so."
I have no comfort except when
Each man tells another his woe.

At eighty his back is bowed, his blood is cold, his eyes are sore; where he was wont to leap he is now led; he grieves that he did not listen to conscience, who wonders at his repentance, but he thanks God for it.

At ninety his life is "but travail and woe." His limbs are bent; he walks with a staff; his teeth have fallen out; his speech is impaired; he has lost flesh and is but skin and bone.

Now am I under Fortune's wheel,
My friends forsake me every one;
And all the sins I loved so well,
Now know I well they are my foen (foes).

Three of the deadly sins—pride, lust and gluttony—now forsake him in his old age. Envy and wrath find he is no good, but sloth and covetousness claim him. Over-hope and wan-hope or presumption and despair then alternately vex him, and in his need the old man calls on the seven virtues to help him.

At a hundred he may stretch out his neck for death's sword; hell-hounds are barking for him, death and friends watching for him. Wan-hope and over-hope tempt him; unless God have mercy he will go to ruin.

Mine age is now a hundred year;
Little I drink and less eat.
On my back I bear my bier,
And all my friends me forget(e).

Fain they would that I dead were;
With angry words they do me threaten,
And say because I'm so long here
When I come home I shall be beaten.

The poem concludes by exhorting man to repent and learn to die; to look in this mirror and choose whether he will go to heaven or hell, and pray to God that after death we may all see His fair Face in perfect love. The poet ends by begging his readers to say an "Ave Maria" and a "Pater Noster" for his soul.

This same Lansbreth MS. contains two lovely little poems, so alike in metre and composition that the same anonymous writer must surely have written them. One is an old man's lament, called from the refrain with which each verse ends, "This World is but a Vanity;" the other is called "Revertere," the last word in each stanza. In the first the poet tells how as he was walking beside a holt under a hill he saw an old man sitting and weeping, who said to him:

Sometime I had the world at will,
With riches and with royalty;
And now it is turned all to ill,
The world is but a vanity.

The old man likens his life to a day and goes on to describe it according to the time of day. First he is like the morning, spotless, but now he is sinful.

Now I am old I weep therefore,
This world is but a vanity.

At mid-morn he learnt to walk and play in the street and to fight with his companions, and all he did then seemed to him sweet, but now he weeps for it.

At undern to school I was set,
To learn lore as other doth.
When my masted would me beat,
I would him curse, I was so wroth.
To learn good I was full loth,
I thought on joy and jollity.
Now, alas! for to say thee sooth,
This world is but a vanity.

This word "undern" meant under-noon, that is, from 9 o'clock to 12. At midday he was dubbed knight and learned to ride so that none was so brave as to stand his charge in battle, but this "too is vanity."

Where is become now all my pride,
My boldness and fair beauty?
Now from death I cannot hide,
This world is but a vanity.

At high noon he was crowned king, and the world was at his will; he fulfilled all his desires, but now age is crept on him; he is going down hill.

This world is but a vanity.
At mydonernoon I drooped fast,

My lust and liking went away;
 From jollity my heart is past,
 From royalty and rich array.
 Man's life here is but a day,
 Against the life that ever shall be,
 And one thing only I dare say,
 This world is but a vanity.

We have lost the beautiful words "undern," for before noon, and "mydour noon," for mid-afternoon, meaning about 3 o'clock. At evensong time he walks with a staff and death seeks him.

When I am dead and laid in grave,
 There is nothing then that saveth me
 But good or evil that I done have,
 This world is but a vanity.

Thus the day comes to night, when he loathes his life; doleful death possesses him, and "in cold clay now shall he cling," which is the only alliterative line in the poem.

Thus an old man I heard mourning,
 Beside a holt under a tree;
 God grant us His bliss everlasting,
 This world is but a vanity.

The poem "Revertere" follows immediately in the MS. and seems evidently meant for a companion piece. The second title is "In English Tongue Turn Again." The poet here describes how he went out hawking with falcon and spaniel and put up a pheasant and flew his falcon at it. He ran on himself, but tripped over a briar, which made him turn back, for on every leaf was written in Latin, *Revertere*.

Revertere is as much to say
 In English tongue as turn again:
 Turn again, man, I thee pray,
 And think heartily what thou has done.

Of thy living bethink thee rife (abundantly),
 In open and in privacy.
 That thou mayst come to everlasting life,
 Take to thy mind *Revertere*.

It was noon on a summer's day that he went hawking, and this summer heat is like man rushing into all kinds of sin in his hot youth; but he must take to heart the advice "*Revertere*," and turn back.

Youth beareth the hawk upon his hand,
 When jollity forgetteth age:
 This hawk is man's heart, I understand,
 For it is young and of high romage (roaming).

Man's heart, like the falcon, is flown after prey instead of to God, and youth spares no thorns to get its pleasures.

He that searcheth the darkness of night,
 And the mist of the morrowtide may see,
 He shall know by Christ's might,
 If youth can sing *Revertere*.

This hawk, man's heart in youth I wis,
 Pursueth ever his pheasant-hen;

This pheasant-hen is likingness (pleasure),
And ever follow her these young men.
There is pleasure in every sin,
Venial and deadly whether it be;
With great pleasure he will begin,
But sorrow brings forth, Revertere.

Desire is the mother of every sin and leads the dance of all sorrow; youth often goes wrong, but it should "turn again," and remember that age will come and then it will be best to say and sing "Revertere."

Therefore every man bethink him well,
How little while is his dwelling;
As holy writ it doth tell
He shall not know without reading (lesinge).
A cock can crow his time midnight,
Which he knoweth well in his degree;
But his time he knoweth not aright
That can never well say Revertere.

Therefore be thou certain, oh! man, that there is none so poor a wretch as thou art.

Therefore pray we to heaven's king,
Every man in his degree,
To grant them bliss everlasting,
That this word well can say Revertere.

Here for the present our space warns us to pass over the other treasures in this volume, to which we hope some day to "Revertere."

DARLEY DALE.

ANCIENT SCOTTISH DEVOTION TO MARY.

THE study of the practices of piety which flourished in past ages can never be without profit. To those outside the Catholic Church it affords the best of object lessons in the identity of the religion cherished by their forefathers with the Catholicism of the twentieth century; for it shows in the clearest light that the true Church of Christ is the same in all lands and at all times. To the Catholic, also, the example of bygone days is equally useful; it cannot but kindle in his heart a more fervent zeal for observances deservedly beloved by his ancestors in the faith. Such is particularly the case with regard to the measure and kind of devotion paid to the Mother of God when Scotland was wholly Catholic.

Just about ten years before the storm of the Reformation burst upon the land, and while ominous clouds were already looming black upon the outlook of those who had eyes to see, the authorities of the Church in Scotland began too late to realize a fact which, more than anything else, was tending towards the success of the new doctrines among the unlettered classes; this was the culpable

neglect by the bulk of the parochial clergy of the regular and systematic instruction of the people in their religion. In addition to the promulgation of laws for the supplying of this need, care was taken to compile a brief summary of Catholic doctrine which might serve as a handbook to fit the clergy for the task newly expected of them. The book became known as "Archbishop Hamilton's Catechism," not because it had been that prelate's personal work, but rather because he had been more active than any of the other Bishops in bringing about its publication. Some extracts from it touching very beautifully upon devotion to the Blessed Virgin and expressing as they do the popular feeling at that period may serve as an introduction to the investigation of earlier ages. The spelling is modernized.¹

The preface to the instruction upon the Ave Maria runs thus:

"We think it expedient for your instruction and spiritual edification to set forth to you a plain declaration of that heavenly salutation which the holy angel Gabriel (sent from the Blessed Trinity) proposed reverently to the glorious lady, the Virgin Mary, when he came to show to her the blessed incarnation of the Son of God.

"Our Mother, the Holy Kirk, has had a use since the Apostles hitherto to propose to all young scholars and learners of Christ's religion certain principles and general documents for their necessary instruction in the doctrines of our Saviour Christ, among which the same heavenly salutation was given to be learned and to be said with the Pater Noster.

"The same salutation should be counted one of the special prayers that a Christian man and woman ought to say, for suppose there is not in it any special petition expressed, yet when it is said distinctly, reverently and devoutly, it stirs up our minds in the faith of the blessed incarnation of Christ; it moves us to contemplation and remembrance of the great benefits of God, and especially that He has given Himself to us; it warns us to love God and thank Him for the same blessed incarnation; it makes us understand the excellent dignity of the Virgin Mary, who was chosen to be Mother of God; it causes us to honor God in her and also her in God; it moves the glorious Virgin to make intercession to her Son for us, and, finally, God Almighty, seeing our meekness, our faith, our contemplation, our love and thanksgiving, our intercession to His Mother, will have mercy upon us.

¹ Archbishop Hamilton's Catechism, original edition. Fort-Augustus Library.

“‘From this time all generations shall call me blessed.’ How can this prophecy of the ordination of God be fulfilled better than when we say to her devoutly, *Ave Maria*? And suppose Turks, Jews, heretics and false Christian men and women will not love the Virgin Mary, and so fulfil this prophecy, yet all true, faithful and devout Christian men and women will love and honor her, saying with the angel, ‘*Invenisti gratiam apud Deum*’—‘O glorious Lady, thou has found grace and honor with God.’

“So, O Christian man, I exhort thee, learn to understand truly the same salutation and to say it devoutly to the glorious Virgin, beseeching Almighty God that where He has given so great abundance and fulness of grace to her, that He would by her intercession give to thee a drop of grace, whereby thou may be saved and come finally to the kingdom of heaven.”

The deep devotion to the Blessed Virgin, so simply yet so eloquently expressed in these extracts, is no less apparent in the national life of the preceding centuries, if we but take the trouble to search out details. It is chiefly shown in the following ways:

1. The dedication of churches, chapels and altars in the name of Mary.
 2. The traditional place-names of the country.
 3. Special bequests in Mary's honor.
 4. Pilgrimages to her shrines and wells.
 5. The veneration paid to her images.
 6. The cherished hymns of the people.
- Some examples of each class will satisfactorily prove our case.

DEDICATION OF CHURCHES.

The naming of churches after the Blessed Virgin may not appear at first sight to be a very strong proof of special devotion to her; yet, on reflection, we cannot help acknowledging it as such. For how can the founder of any particular church express more publicly his special predilection for this or that saint than in the choice of the patron whose name the building is to perpetuate? We have only to place ourselves in such a position to realize to the full the significance of the action. When there is question of a church built by some religious order the devotion is still apparent, although it is displayed by a corporate body rather than by an individual. With this premise we may turn to the consideration of examples.

Benedictines have always shown such variety in their dedications that the choice of Our Lady as titular of any of their churches argues a particular love for her. Many abbeys owned by Black

Monks in Scotland were thus distinguished. One of these was Kelso, the first foundation in the country of Benedictines belonging to the fervent reform instituted in the Abbey of Tiron in Picardy. Kilwinning in Ayrshire, Lindores in Fifeshire, Lesmahago in Lanarkshire, Fyvie in Aberdeenshire—monasteries of the same body—were all styled St. Mary's. So also was the picturesque abbey, afterwards raised to the dignity of a cathedral, which still forms in its state of ruin the prominent object of interest on bleak Iona.

Cluniac Benedictines almost invariably dedicated their monastic churches to Our Lady. Their Scottish foundations were no exception. Paisley, the chief of these, was renowned not only for beauty of architecture, but for picturesqueness of site also. Crossraguel in Ayrshire, its daughter, was no less worthy of its heavenly patroness.

Cistercians, or White Monks, made the Blessed Virgin their titular in almost every case. In Scotland the order possessed as many as twenty-eight houses, and all except two or three were named after Mary. Among them were some of extraordinary beauty. The delicate carvings of Melrose are world-famed; Sweetheart, or New Abbey, near Dumfries, recalling as it does the wifely devotion of the Lady Devorgilla, who built it to enshrine the heart of her beloved husband, has a charm beyond mere loveliness; Dundrennan, Newbattle and Kinloss were all noble churches when in their glory.

We find a like practice as regards dedication existing among other religious. Many of the churches of both White and Black Canons had the Blessed Virgin as their titular. The stately Norman pile of Jedburgh, as well as the churches of Scone, Cambuskenneth, Holywood and Dryburgh are examples. Dominicans usually followed the same pious custom. Their houses in Scotland numbered twelve. The Carmelites did the same; their foundations were seventeen in number. Other orders named some of their churches after Our Lady. Among them the Franciscans, whose fine buildings at Glasgow and Aberdeen and probably others were named St. Mary's.

Among the churches served by the secular clergy the cathedrals claim first mention. Of these Aberdeen bore the title of St. Mary and St. Machar. Dornoch, in Sutherland, built by its Bishop, St. Gilbert, in honor of Our Lady, received in later ages his own name in addition. St. Mary's Abbey, on Iona, became the cathedral of the diocese of the Isles shortly before the Reformation.

To enumerate all the churches and chapels which, through the length and breadth of Scotland, rejoiced in having the Mother of God as their titular would be an impossibility, not only on account of their number, but also because the title of so many has been

altogether lost sight of. It will, however, be of interest to trace some of them, scattered through the various ancient dioceses.

In the north Aberdeen is remarkable as having possessed several. In the city itself was one dedicated to *S. Maria ad Nives*, commonly known as the "Snow Kirk." It has now disappeared, though its ancient cemetery, called "Snow Cemetery," is still in use. Besides the Grey Friars' church already mentioned, King's College chapel was dedicated to Our Lady, as also two, if not three, chapels on or near the bridges over the Don and the Dee. In the cathedral the high altar and two others were named in her honor. The parish church of St. Nicholas had chapels to Our Lady of Pity, both in the upper church and in the crypt. The latter is still known as "Pitty Vault."

There were several of Our Lady's churches and chapels throughout the county. Among them were the churches of Auchindoir, Kintore, Glenmuick, Ellon, Fyvie, Deer and Monimusk. Chapels existed at Stoneywood, in the parish of Newhills, Rothmaise, in the parish of Rayne, Meldrum, where was also a holy well, and other localities. The chief one in the county, however, was that known as "The Chapel of the Garioch," which has given its name to a parish. It was founded at a date earlier than 1357, before which time Christian of Bruce, sister of Robert I. and Lady of the Garioch, made provision for a perpetual chaplain to say Mass there for her brother the King, her husband and herself. In 1384 Margaret, Countess of Douglas, made other foundations in the chapel, and after the battle of Harlaw, in 1411, Alexander, Earl of Mar, provided perpetual Masses for the souls of the slain, and Isabel, widow of the Baron of Balquhain, did the same for her six sons, who had fallen in that fight, and also for her deceased husband. St. Mary's thus became a collegiate institution, with at least six chaplains. Queen Mary Stuart when making her progress to the north, in 1562, spent a night at Balquhain Castle and assisted next morning at Mass in the chapel of the Garioch.

In the neighboring county of Banff, Cullen possessed a collegiate Church of St. Mary served by a provost and six prebendaries. It still exists and is remarkable for its handsome stone "Sacrament House" in the north wall of the chancel. Banff and Cabrach also had churches dedicated to Our Lady.

Turning to the still more northerly diocese of Caithness, we find many traces of similar devotion to Mary. Besides the Church of Kilmuir, in the parish of Kildonan, there were chapels bearing her name at Duncansbay and Sibster. Regarding the latter a Protestant writer of the eighteenth century says: "To the west of the town of Wick, at a mile's distance on the north side of the water,

stands an old chapple called Marykirk, which the commons did superstitiously frequent on the first Sabbath after the new moon."² In the parish of Halkirk, were several chapels, but their dedications are no longer known to us. It may well be that some of those existing at Farr, in Sutherland, were Our Lady's. That at Loch Naver, for example, had a healing well which used to be visited on the first Mondays of February, May, August and November. Two of those months suggest the feasts of the Purification and Assumption. The writer already quoted thus mentions a chapel in the parish of Latheron, in Caithness: "Within a mile of the sea, upon the brink of this water (Dunbeath) is the chapel of Balclay. It's certain it was built in the time of Poperia, and I can give no further account of it."³ Several other chapels once existed in the neighborhood, but their dedication cannot be traced.

Before leaving this northern district the writer cannot resist the temptation of quoting once more from the same quaint writer with reference to the absence of religious establishments so far north. "There are no apparent vestiges in this parish," he says, when referring to one of them, "of Popish monasteries, abbacies or other religious societies, and few or none in our countrey, being too cold a clime and barren a soyle for that fry to nestle in."⁴

In the diocese of Ross there were many dedications to Our Lady in the churches of Kilmuir, Wester and Lumlair and the chapels at Delny, Tollie and Ormondhill (still called Lady Hill). A chapel at Balnagowan, in the parish of Tarbat, known as St. Mary's, was served by several chaplains. This was the case at Delny also. The cathedral at Rosemarkie had a "Blessed Virgin's Aisle." One of the bells of the church bore the names of Mary and Boniface—the latter being the titular saint.

The diocese of Moray could claim many similar churches and chapels. Inverness had a parish church as well as a chapel and cemetery bearing Our Lady's name. There was a chapel at Duffus and another in the castle near Elgin, while at Kincragy was one in which John de Hay, in 1374, founded a chaplaincy for the benefit of his own soul and those of his progenitors and successors and of all the faithful. In the same diocese was the chapel of Our Lady of Grace, to which we shall have to return later.

In the diocese of the Isles were numerous dedications. In the island of Mull were Kilmore, Kilmore and Tobermory. At the latter place was also a holy well. The island of Rum had Kilmory; in Skye were Kilmuir and another Kilmuir near Dunvegan Loch. South Uist had a Church of Our Lady at Howmore. North Uist

² Macfarlane's "Geographical Collection," A. D. 1726.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*

had Kilmuir; Lingay, in its neighborhood, Kilmoor. At Pabby (Harris), on Island More (Holy Isles), and on St. Kilda were others, with a cemetery on the latter island. On Lewis was a church which a document of 1536 speaks of as "Our Lady in Barwas."

Argyle diocese had churches of the Blessed Virgin at Kilmore, Kilmory in Ardnamurchan, Kilmorie in Arran and Dunoon (probably). There were chapels at Glassary and at Scarbay in Jura. Fordun, the historian, mentions the latter as noted for miracles. Rothesay parish church coupled the names of St. Mary and Brioc in its dedication. At Strathlachlan and Lochgoilhead there is record of Lady altars in the churches.

Coming to the neighborhood of Glasgow we find the collegiate Church of St. Mary and St. Anne within the city, as well as a chapel of Our Lady and the Dominican and Franciscan churches. The cathedral had a Lady altar outside the Rood Screen, which may still be seen, and another altar in the nave besides one in the undercroft of the church. Rutherglen, Renfrew, Carstairs and Skirling had churches dedicated to her. The latter place had also a holy well bearing her name. Chapels existed near Dalpatrick, near Cambuslang, near Renfrew and at Parrokhalm. At West Linton (Tweed-dale) was a chapel of St. Mary to which Christian, daughter of Sir Adam FitzGilbert, gave her lands of Ingolstun to support three chaplains. One of these was to say daily the Mass of the Holy Ghost; a second, that of the faithful departed, and a third, the Mass of the day. No trace of the building now remains.⁵ In the parish church of Inchinnan was a Lady altar, whose chaplain was supported by the revenues of a piece of land styled "Lady Acre." It is a curious fact that centuries after the church had become Protestant the incumbent was forced, in order to make his title good to the aforesaid land, to style himself "Chaplain of the Lady Altar." The case occurs nowhere else in Scotland in similar circumstances. The last charter granted by a minister under the ancient Catholic title was dated 1821. It began thus: "To all and sundry to whose knowledge these presents shall come, I, the Rev. William Richardson, Doctor in Divinity, Minister of the Gospel and of the Kirk and parish of Inchinnan, and undoubted chaplain of the altarage and altar, commonly called Our Lady's Altar, and as such, undoubted superior of the lands after mentioned, &c."⁶ The property has now passed into lay hands.

To continue this branch of the subject would be wearying. With the enumeration of a few more notable churches dedicated to the

⁵ The chief authorities followed in this branch of the subject are "*Origines Parochiales Scotiæ*," "*Collections for the Shires of Aberdeen and Banff*," "*Registrum Episc. Morav.*," "*Reg. Episc. Aberdon.*" and "*Reg. Episc. Brechinens.*"

⁶ "*New Statist. Account of Scot.*," vol. vii., p. 132.

Blessed Virgin in other parts of the country we may, therefore, take leave of it. Dundee and Haddington parish churches, the Chapel Royal at Stirling, the collegiate churches of Lochwinnoch, Biggar, Lincluden, Maybole and elsewhere and the College of St. Mary in the University of St. Andrews are among the most important.

As regards altars of Blessed Mary, every cathedral possessed at least one—generally outside the Rood Screen. There was always one, too, in every church of any note, and not seldom more than one. St. John's, at Perth, had one in honor of the Annunciation and another of the Visitation. The collegiate Church of St. Giles, Edinburgh, had no less than five—the Lady altar, St. Mary and Gabriel, Our Lady and St. Roch, the Visitation and Our Lady of Pity. Many other instances of such altars will occur in the enumeration of the bequests made in honor of the Mother of God, but we may mention here a Blessed Virgin's aisle in the Grey Friars' church at Lanark and a Lady Chapel in Lanark parish church.

PLACE NAMES.

It is not necessary to repeat here the many examples of places called after Mary in such names as Kilmuir, Kilmory, to which allusion has already been made. Another form of the name is found in Marykirk, Kilmorach and Kilmarie (Forfarshire). Dalmary, or Maryfield, is in Stirlingshire, Maryholm in Kirkcudbrightshire, while "Marisland" occurs often in old charters. In Ross-shire and in the Island of Mull are to be found St. Mary's Loch, St. Mary's Isle is in Kirkcudbrightshire, Mary Well in Forfarshire, Maryton in the same county, while Marynett occurs in connection with charters of fishings possessed by the abbey of Cambuskenneth. Maryhill, Marydale, Maryculter are other examples.

The places taking their names from the title "Our Lady" are even more numerous. Dunbar has "Our Lady's Lands;" Scone, "Our Lady Petie Land;" Strathisla, Banffshire, "Oure Lady Land." At Avoch, Ross-shire, is Lady Hill and at Elgin is another with a Mary Well close by. In Grange parish, Banffshire, are to be found another Lady Hill and Lady Well. A peat-moss belonging to the comechanged to Ladybank. There is a Ladyfield near Dundee, Ladychanged to Ladybank. There is a Ladyfield near Dundee, Ladybankis in Kincardineshire and Ladyloan in Forfarshire. At Lanark "Our Lady's Akr" is still commemorated in Lady Acre Road. There was a Lady Acre at Kilwinning also. At Dailly, in Ayrshire, is Ladyglen at Kirkcolm in Wigtownshire, Lady Cave and Lady Bay, while Ladycroft, Ladyburn, Ladykirk and Ladywell occur in many parts of Scotland. A whole parish as well as a street has

been named from the Lady Well by the Molendinar Burn at Glasgow. On the land of Prestbuie Farm, in the parish of Whithorn, is a spring called Mother Water. The town of Motherwell, near Glasgow, mentioned as early as a charter of 1352, takes its name from a holy well which was formerly treasured there.⁷

In connection with this branch of the subject may be mentioned fairs held in honor of Our Lady. Many of these were instituted on account of the dedication of the particular parish church to her; the patronal feast bringing a concourse of people to the church would give rise to the fair in question. The very word "fair" is derived from the Latin *feria*, a holiday. But there are other fairs bearing Our Lady's name which do not show a like origin. Some examples may be quoted, without reference to the particular reason of the institution of each.

Candlemas fairs were held by royal authority at Biggar in Lanarkshire, Campbeltown in Argyleshire, Doune in Perthshire, Kinloss in Moray and other places. It is to be noted that when fairs were thus granted the particular feast of the Blessed Virgin was designated in a way differing from our present custom. "Lady Day," for instance, did not as a rule mean the Annunciation, but the Immaculate Conception, as appears from a grant made to Ellon. The Annunciation always figures as "Lady Day in Lentron," the Assumption is styled "Lady Day in Harvest," the Nativity "Latter Lady Day." There was a "Marymas Fair" at Ellon and also at Geddes in Nairnshire on the Annunciation. A more customary day was the Nativity, as at Greenlaw in Berwickshire, Inverury in Aberdeenshire, Ballinlach in Wigtownshire, Bonnakettle in Kirkcudbrightshire and Dunbar. Inverness, Jedburgh, Dunnet in Caithness and Kilmalie in Argyleshire held Mary Fairs on the Assumption. Some fairs lasted for three or more days.⁸

BEQUESTS IN HONOR OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN.

Whatever may be thought as to the naming of churches after the Mother of God, no one will dispute the fact that special bequests in her honor are indubitable proofs of particular devotion to her. Many examples of the kind may be called from the records of cathedrals, churches and religious houses.

The register of the diocese of Moray shows us that the parish church of Elgin, the cathedral city, was dedicated to St. Giles, and that it had an altar of Our Lady to which the citizens made frequent donations. Thus in 1343 Adam de Berewyc gave a stone of wax

⁷ Much information has been gathered from Mackinlay's "Pre-Reformation Church of Scotland and Scottish Place-names."

⁸ Sir D. Marwick's "Scottish Fairs and Markets."

yearly for the sustentation of the "Blessed Virgin's Light." John de Moray, we may mention, made a similar donation, at a later period, to Our Lady's altar in the cathedral. William Pop, burgess of Elgin, "reverently desiring to honor the Son through the Mother, and the Mother through the Son, acknowledging her as the special refuge of the faithful and the never-failing helper of all men," established a perpetual chaplaincy at the altar of "the glorious Virgin Mary, Mother of God," in the church of St. Giles. Richard, son of John, another burgess, provided for another chaplain at the same altar, who should celebrate Mass for his own soul and for the souls of his father and mother and all the faithful departed.

At the Lady altar in the cathedral there was at least one special chaplaincy. At Elgin, as well as in all cathedrals and many monasteries at that period, the "Mary Mass" was sung to note every morning after the Office of Prime, in addition to the Mass of that particular day, which was celebrated at a later hour. At Elgin another daily Mass of Our Lady was celebrated in the chapel of St. Thomas the Martyr in the cemetery, where five chaplains had been provided for five daily Masses—that of St. Thomas, sung to note, and others of the feast of the day, the Blessed Virgin, St. John Baptist and the faithful departed. When we bear in mind that the city possessed a Lady Chapel in the castle on Lady Hill, a church of Black Friars and one of the Grey Friars—in both of which much was daily done for Mary's glory—we are bound to conclude that Elgin bore its share in honoring her.⁹

Turning to the records of Aberdeen Cathedral, we find that in addition to the daily sung Mass of the Blessed Virgin, at which the canons were required to assist, there was a weekly Mass of Our Lady of Compassion every Wednesday, provided for by Alexander Kyd, one of the precentors, and celebrated at the Lady altar in the nave. The feast of the Visitation was kept in this church with an octave, and on festivals rich tapestries representing scenes in the life of the Blessed Virgin were hung in the sanctuary. In 1420 Thomas de Lyn provided for three Masses weekly in the Black Friars' church in the city, at the altar of Our Lady, and in other ways, as we shall see later, Aberdeen was notable for honoring Mary.¹⁰

The register of Brechin affords similar examples. At the Lady altar in the cathedral were several chaplaincies. One of them was for a Mass of Requiem for the founder, to be said every Wednesday. A perpetual daily Mass was endowed in this cathedral by one of the canons, and on Saturdays it was to be always that of the Blessed

⁹ *Reg. Episc. Morar.*

¹⁰ *Reg. Episc. Aberdon.*

Mary. David, Earl of Crawford and Lord of Lindsay, provided in 1472 for the daily singing during the chief Mass of the *Ave Gloriosa* in honor of Our Lady, "for the salvation of his own soul, the souls of his predecessors and successors and the souls of all the faithful." In the chapel of St. Mary Magdalen a weekly Mass was offered in honor of the Blessed Trinity, Blessed Mary the Virgin and Blessed Magdalen. In the city stood the Hospital of St. Mary, to which other chaplaincies were attached. Not far from Brechin, in the barony of Menmuir, was a hermitage bearing Mary's name, while another of her chapels existed at Kermyle.¹¹

The city of Perth was particularly remarkable for its devotion to the Blessed Virgin. Its great Church of St. John Baptist, of cathedral-like proportions, had gained for the city the familiar designation of "St. John's Town." It measured 207 feet in length. Attached to this church were no less than forty chaplaincies, five of which were in honor of Our Lady. Thus Alan de Myrtoun, burgess of Perth, founded an altar of the Blessed Virgin in 1431 and endowed it with lands and tenements for the support of its priest. In 1491 Robert de Chalmer and Catherine his wife made provision for a chaplain at St. Andrew's altar, "in honor of the Virgin Mary and the Presentation of our Saviour in the Temple." In the same year Master James Fenton, Vicar of Tippemuir, endowed the same altar with another chaplaincy in honor of Our Lady of Consolation. Patrick Wallis, burgess, in 1513, gave his dwelling house to provide a rental for the altar of the Annunciation. In addition to these there was an altar styled "Our Lady's Grace," or the Visitation, to which the chaplain, Sir Simon Young, added in 1514 an increased annual income.

In the town itself, near the bridge, stood a beautiful Lady chapel, built, according to the pious custom of Catholic ages, to provide a little sanctuary where the wayfarer might find a quiet retreat in which to retire for a few moments from the din and bustle of a city's traffic, to breathe a prayer to the Mother of God for a blessing upon the day's toil. It may have been that in this, as in similar chapels, the Holy Sacrifice was offered at an early hour for those about to start on a journey—another thoughtful provision of the ages of faith. Another chapel of the Blessed Virgin bore the name of Allareit, a corruption of Loreto. Like similar chapels in other localities of England and Scotland, it was a replica of the holy house.

Besides the above there were other sanctuaries of Mary. A noble Dominican church bore her name, served by an order always devout to her. It was enriched at various times with endowments to promote her honor. The Carmelites—Our Lady's own order—pos-

¹¹ *Reg. Episc. Brech.*

sessed a fine church in the city. Another was served by Carthusians, who are bound by their rule to recite daily the Office of the Blessed Virgin.¹²

Edinburgh was another city which may be cited as an example of devotion to Mary. The records of the collegiate church of St. Giles afford much information on the subject, and it will be interesting to note some of the benefactions made by the citizens towards that object.

In 1362 we find John de Allynecrum giving all his lands at Craigmuck to provide a chaplain at the altar of the Blessed Virgin. In the following year William More, Lord of Abercorn, endows a chaplaincy at the same altar with his lands of Ravelston. William Hare at about the same time makes a further donation of land for a like purpose. A long list of annual rentals coming to the altar in the year 1369 enumerates benefactions which though of small value at that date must have become of considerable worth in after time. In many instances it is stated "the land belongs to the Blessed Mary." In 1426 John de Alnecrum, perhaps a descendant of the earlier donor of that name, bestows upon the altar **half a mark** every year. Alan Brown, burgess, in 1484, provides for the maintenance of a wax candle to burn continually on the "hers" or stand before it. At about the same date James Townys, another burgess, endows the altar of Our Lady of Pity, situated near the north door of the choir, with a yearly revenue of 14 marks. Richard Hopper, in 1502, makes an annual bequest to the altar of Our Lady and St. Roch, standing in the new aisle of St. Thomas the Martyr. This Richard was the founder of the altar of the Visitation also. In 1513 Sir Alexander Lauder de Blyth, Provost of Edinburgh, bestows an annual rental of 55 marks upon the chaplaincy at the altar recently founded by him in the new aisle of the Virgin and St. Gabriel. He also endowed a lamp in the same chapel to burn from St. Michael's Day to the feast of the Purification every year. John Stury, "for the welfare of his soul," made a similar bequest of a perpetual candle before Our Lady's altar. In 1535 Sir Adam Ottirburn, provost, gives certain yearly rents to provide prayers for others and a dirge for himself after death. The burgh records relate that on January 22, 1556, "the provost, baillies and counsall . . . thinks expedient . . . to repair Our Lady's altar and make an aisle thereof." This restoration and improvement in St. Giles', at the expense of the burgh, is a proof of the strong hold of religion upon the minds of men in authority.

The Chamberlain's accounts of the reign of James III. mention an act of devotion shown by the King in the above church :

¹² Lawson's "Book of Perth."

Item on Sanct Mongoy's da (i. e., St. Mungo or Kentigern) in Edingh.
to the King to offer in Sanct Geyllis Kirk..... xviii. s.
Item, the same da to our Lady's licht..... ix. s.

A flight of steps, "callit Our Lady's Steppis," led up to the north-east corner of the church from the street. Their designation was owing to a statue of the Blessed Virgin which stood near them. The very bells of St. Giles' Church spoke of devotion to Mary. The Lady bell was melted for cannon at the time of the Reformation. Another, known as the Vesper bell, bore the inscription:

O Mater Del: Memento Mei: Anno: D: M: IIII.

The "great bell" bore a representation of the Virgin and Child. Edinburgh, like many other towns, had a Carmelite friary as well as a Dominican house, each, no doubt, possessing a Lady chapel. Holyrood Abbey, too, must have had its Lady altar in common with other religious houses.¹³

Those registers of cathedral and abbey churches which yet remain to us teem with examples of donations similar to those above quoted. Sir Duncan Sybald, for instance, in 1286, made an annual grant to the Cistercian abbey of Cupar of a stone of wax and four shillings to provide lights for the Mary Mass. James, Lord Hamilton, granting in 1459 ground for the buildings of Glasgow College, made it a condition that the scholars should for all future time sing daily an *Ave Maria*, "on their bended knees," for the welfare of his soul. But enough has been said to illustrate the practical character of the devotion of all classes towards the Blessed Virgin during the ages of faith.

PILGRIMAGES.

Scotland possessed many noted sanctuaries of Our Lady which were an attraction to devout pilgrims. One of the most popular of these was the Church of St. Mary, Whitekirk, in the County of Haddington. In the twelfth century it became the property of the canons of Holyrood. From an early period this church became the resort of pilgrims on account of a much venerated statue of the Blessed Virgin which was kept there. Scottish historians relate that when Edward III. of England invaded Scotland, in 1356, a sailor of his fleet, having entered the church with some companions, was tempted by the sight of the costly jewels that adorned the image to try to pluck off a ring from the finger. The story goes that a crucifix, falling from a height, dashed out his brains as he was making the sacrilegious attempt. The ship, too, which was bearing off the spoils of many sacred buildings, is said to have been wrecked in a violent storm off Tynemouth. It was to this church

¹³ *Vide passim*, Cameron-Lees, "St. Giles, Edinburgh."

that the renowned Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, afterwards Pope Pius II., made a pilgrimage on landing in the country after a tempestuous voyage. The walk barefoot over frozen paths for ten miles produced a chronic rheumatism from which he suffered for the rest of his life.

Another place of pilgrimage of scarcely less note was the church known as "the Lady Kirk of Kyle." It stood in the parish of Monkton, in Ayrshire. Its renown may be gathered from the fact that James IV., a sovereign remarkable for his devotion to pilgrimages, never passed near this church without making an offering. A few ruins are all that now remain of this once famous sanctuary. Newhaven, near Edinburgh, had a chapel dedicated to Our Lady and St. James, which was a favorite resort of pilgrims. It is recorded of James IV. that he made an offering of fourteen shillings in this "Ladye Chapell." Newhaven itself, which owed its origin to the prosperous trading times of that monarch, was originally called "Our Lady's Port of Grace."

In 1472 the people of Ayr founded in their town a house of Observantine Friars. In the church in after years was preserved a statue of the Blessed Virgin which became the object of much devotion. "A statue of the Virgin Mary in this convent," remarks a Protestant writer, "is said to have wrought many miracles; fictions these, which no doubt gained the Grey Friars some credit and some profit."¹⁴ A Catholic will more readily accept the testimony of a Franciscan writer, Wadding, as to the fact, without subscribing to the sneering comment given above. James IV. in his visits to Ayr used to bestow generous donations on the friars, and there is a record of £10 offered there by James V. in 1530. The old parish church, as it is called, built after the Reformation, occupies the site of this popular sanctuary, not a vestige of which now remains. A spring of excellent water, still known as "Friars' Well," is all that recalls its memory.

Musselburgh, in the vicinity of Edinburgh, possessed a chapel renowned for the miracles wrought there and roused the spite and bigotry of writers of Protestant tendency. This was the Loreto Chapel, built about 1533, by a hermit named Thomas Douchtie. He had made a pilgrimage to the holy house and had brought back a small portion of the building, which he enshrined in the little chapel which the donations of the faithful enabled him to raise. This became known as "St. Allareit, or "Lariet," both words being corruptions of "Chapelle of Lauret." Many relics were in course of time enshrined there, and devotion to Our Lady drew crowds of pilgrims to the place. A proof of the widespread attraction to

¹⁴ Chalmers, "Caledonia," Ayr.

this holy shrine is furnished by the visit made to it on foot by James V., in 1536, when about to start for France to bring home a bride. A Protestant writer with uncalled-for rancor remarks upon the King's action: "If the pilgrimage helped to bring Mary of Guise to Scotland, Scotland had little cause for gratitude therefor." The bride whom James won by that journey was Magdalene of France, the darling of the Scottish nation, whose early death after a few months of wedded happiness brought grief to all, and not the much suffering Queen Regent, so hated by Knox and his crew for her staunch Catholicity. The sneer is therefore robbed of its sting. This famous chapel fell a victim to the rage of the Reformers. It was cast down and its stones used to build the Tolbooth of the burgh.

There was another favorite place of pilgrimage for northern Scotland near Fochabers in Banffshire. It was called the "Chapel of Our Lady of Grace." Long after the Reformation, and even to some extent up to this day, the veneration of the people continued unabated. About the year 1638 all that remained of the building was thrown down in order to stop the resort of Catholics thither, though to no purpose. A writer of the eighteenth century bears witness to the multitudes in his day that flocked to the place from the Western Isles. "Nothing short of violence," he says, "can restrain their superstition." Protestants, even, in recent times have taken pleasure in visiting the sacred spot and drinking from its holy well. An account of the devotion of a noble Catholic to this sanctuary has been preserved to us in the narrative left by her chaplain, Fr. Blakhal, of the yearly visit of the Countess of Aboyne, in the seventeenth century:

"Shortly heirafter, in the octave of the Assumption of Our Lady, she did go to the Bogge of Gight to see her mother-in-law, my Ladye Marqueis of Huntly, and go from thence a pillgrimage, two milles, to Our Lady of Grace, in Murray Land. It had bein of old a very devote place, and many pillgrimages had bein made to it from al the partes in the Northe of Scotland; but then there was nothing standing of it but some brocken walles, which the minister made throw downe within the chappell, to hinder the people to pray there. . . . She used to make that pillgrimage every year so long as she hed health to do it, a mater of threttie (30) milles from her owne house, wherof she made two of them afoot, and barefooted, next to the chapel."¹⁵

There was another Banffshire Lady Well which was an object of pilgrimage even after the Reformation. This was at Ordiquhill,

¹⁵ "A Brieffe Narration," by Gilbert Blakhal (Spalding Club), p. 71. "Bog of Gight" is the old name for Gordon Castle.

not far from Banff. It was reputed miraculous and became the subject of legislation on the part of the Presbyterian Kirk. In the General Assembly that met at Linlithgow in 1608 this well and that in Speyside, referred to above, were vigorously reprobated. A specimen of the hatred of pilgrimages after the Reformation is seen in the action of Assembly of the Kirk, held at Aberdeen in 1630. After fining a lady £5 for sending her child to St. Fiacre's well to obtain a cure in sickness, it ordained that any future pilgrim to a reputed holy well should be "answered in penalty and repentance in such degree as fornicators" were.

There were many other sacred places dedicated to Our Lady which were frequented by the devout. Among the holy wells that bore her name were not a few to which miraculous powers were attributed. The number of such wells cannot now be accurately estimated. In a list compiled in 1883 by Mr. J. Russel Walker for the Society of Antiquaries, seventy-five Mary Wells are mentioned, but it is probable that many have been lost sight of.

SACRED IMAGES.

It is interesting to note in this connection certain features of devotion to Mary which some persons in these days are inclined to stigmatize as foreign in character. Yet there is unmistakable evidence that they were common to Scottish churches before the Reformation. These were the clothing and crowning of statues, placing jewels upon them, burning votive candles before them, carrying them in procession and the like.

We may take Aberdeen Cathedral as an example. The chief image of the Mother of God honored in that church was that of Our Lady of Pity, which stood in the nave near an altar dedicated to her. The particular title, continually met with in Scotland as in England, has been considered by many authorities on the subject as equivalent to what we style in these days a *Pietà*. The statue at Aberdeen, however, represented the Mother bearing the Divine Infant in her arms; for the crowns belonging to the figures are spoken of in an inventory as those of "the Blessed Virgin and her little Son, Jesus."

The image in question was greatly venerated. Alexander Kyd, precentor of the cathedral, gave a yearly revenue to provide two candles to burn continually in its honor. Canon Clatt presented a candle-holder, upon which the faithful might burn their tapers before it. Bishop Elphinstone provided for it a large candelabrum, which on feast days was filled with lighted candles. On great occasions the statue was clothed in a rich mantle and shoes set with beryls.

Votive hearts of silver hung near it, and other offerings spoke of graces received through prayers said there.

A smaller image of solid silver, the gift of Master Andrew Lyall, another member of the chapter, in 1499, used to be carried in procession on festivals by order of Bishop Elphinstone, who granted an indulgence to all who should take part. A still smaller image of precious metal was exposed in the sanctuary on great feasts, together with relics and other sacred objects.¹⁶

At a later period an ancient wooden statue, which once stood in the chapel of the Brig of Dee, was removed to the cathedral by Bishop Dunbar, who died in 1532. After escaping destruction, several times attempted without success, at the hands of Protestants, the statue was finally carried to the continent and eventually placed in the church of the Augustinians at Brussels, the Infanta Isabella having arrayed it in a magnificent robe and many of her own jewels. It was hidden away during the French Revolution, and afterwards placed in the church of Finisterre, Brussels. There it is still honored under the title of "Our Lady of Good Success."¹⁷

A statue in the cathedral of St. Andrews was known as the "Douglas Virgin." Archibald, Earl of Douglas, bestowed upon it a yearly revenue to provide two candles to burn continually before it. The image of Our Lady of Consolation stood near one of the altars in the nave of Glasgow Cathedral. Archbishop Blacader arranged that every evening after Compline the canons should assemble round it and there sing one of the anthems of the Blessed Virgin with the proper versicle and prayer. The same prelate founded a perpetual chaplaincy at the altar of Our Lady of Pity.

Many bequests are to be found in mediæval documents for lights before statues and altars. Some have been already quoted. The burgh records of Dunfermline contain many references to "Our Lady's lights" in the abbey church, which were provided for by revenues called "Our Lady's licht silver."

Near Haddington stood a Cistercian abbey for nuns. On one occasion, when the buildings were in extreme danger of being washed away by a flood in 1358, a nun is said to have saved them from destruction by bringing to the edge of the water a statue of Our Lady.

These examples will be sufficient to show the nature of the honor paid to images of the Mother of God in Catholic Scotland. But there is another way in which the representation of her figure was made use of, no less important in testifying to the love in which she was held. This was by employing it in official seals. That a

¹⁶ *Regis. Episc. Aberd.*

¹⁷ Waterton, "Pietas Mariana Brit."

cathedral, abbey, monastery or church should do this, especially when Our Lady happened to be the titular patron, is not remarkable; but it is striking to find civil corporations choosing the figure of the Blessed Virgin in such a case. Among the burghs which did this were those of Dundee, Newhaven, Jedburgh, Irvine, Selkirk, Rutherglen, Crail, Cullen and Inverness. The latter town substituted, subsequently to 1439, the crucifix on the shield—the present arms of the burgh.¹⁸

POPULAR HYMNS AND SONGS.

Striking evidence of the love of Catholics in Scotland for the Blessed Virgin is to be found in the traditional songs and hymns cherished by those who have always preserved the faith. In two splendid volumes entitled "*Carmina Gadelica*," Mr. Alexander Carmichael has embodied the labors of forty years spent in collecting orally more than two hundred specimens of the traditional hymns of the people of the Highlands and Western Isles.¹⁹ These *Carmina* are given in their original Gaelic, accompanied by a translation made by the compiler. All are deeply religious in character, consisting of invocations of the Blessed Trinity, Our Blessed Lord, His Mother and the saints in all the circumstances of daily life. It is remarkable how constantly the thought of Mary runs through almost all, even when the context may not seem to suggest it. Whenever, for instance, Jesus is mentioned, He is nearly always styled "Son of Mary Virgin." In invocations of St. Michael, St. Columba, St. Bridget or other saints Mary's name is continually introduced. It is as though the hymn wanted completeness if no mention were made of the "Queen of all Saints." Examples alone can give an adequate idea of the devotional beauty of these truly poetic songs, some of them dating from the eighth century.

A GENERAL SUPPLICATION.

God, listen to my prayer,
Bend to me Thine ear,
Let my supplication and my prayers
Ascend to Thee upwards;
Come, Thou King of Glory,
To protect me down,
Thou King of life and mercy,
With the aid of the Lamb,
Thou Son of Mary Virgin,
To protect me with power,
Thou son of the lovely Mary,
Of purest, fairest beauty.

Another in which Our Lady is mentioned, though not directly invoked, is the following:

Thou Son of the Mary of graces,
Of exceeding white purity of beauty,
Joy were it to me to be in the fields of Thy riches.
O Christ, my beloved,
O Christ of the Holy Blood,
By day and by night I praise Thee.

¹⁸ Laing, "*Ancient Scottish Seals*."

¹⁹ "*Carmina Gadelica*," Constable & Co., Edinburgh.

A more direct appeal for the help of Our Lady is to be found in that entitled:

A PRAYER.

O God,
In my deeds,
In my words,
In my wishes,
In my reason,
And in the fulfilling of my desires,
In my sleep,
In my dreams,
In my repose,
In my thoughts,
In my heart and soul always,
May the blessed Virgin Mary
And the promised Branch of Glory dwell.
Oh! in my heart and soul always
May the blessed Virgin Mary
And the fragrant Branch of Glory dwell.

There are invocations of Our Lady at the kindling of the fire:

I will raise the hearth-fire
As Mary would.
The encirclement of Bride and of Mary
On the fire and on the floor,
And on the household all.

* * * * *
Who are those watching over my sleep?
The fair loving Mary and her Lamb.

The following are prayers before fishing or the chase:

* O Mary, tender-fair, gentle-fair,
* Avoid thou to me the silvery salmon dead on the salt sea.
* * * * *
O Mary, fragrant Mother of my King,
Crown thou me with the crown of thy peace;
Place thine own regal robe of gold around me,
And save me with the saving of Christ.

Before traveling is used the following:

The fair white Mary still uphold me,
The Shepherd Jesu be my shield.

Here are some beautiful herding blessings:

Mary, thou Mother of Saints,
Bless our flocks and bearing kine;
Hate nor scath let not come near us,
Drive from us the ways of the wicked.

Another, after the invocation of the Blessed Trinity, runs:

* * * * *
May Mary the mild keep the sheep. * * * * *
May the Son of Mary Virgin preserve the flocks.

Another is for singing when the sheep are being driven to summer pastures:

Shield, oh shield us, pure Virgin of nobleness.
Mary beloved! Mother of the White Lamb,

There are songs for reaping, grinding corn, milking the cow and other household duties. Many of the sleep consecrations or bed blessings are full of charm:

I lie down to-night
With fair Mary and with her Son.

I am lying down to-night as beseems
In the fellowship of Christ, Son of the Virgin golden.

I am lying down to-night
With Mary mild and with her Son;
With the Mother of my King,
Who is shielding me from harm.

* * * * *

God and Mary and Michael
And the cross of the Nine Angels fair
Be shielding me.

* * * * *

O God! O Mary of glory!
O Jesu! Son of the Virgin fragrant,
Sain ye us from the pains everlasting
And from the fire fierce and murky.

With a version of the *Salve Regina* we bring these quotations to an end:

Hail Mary! Hail Mary!
Queen of Grace, Mother of Mercy;
Hail, Mary, in manner surpassing,
Fount of our health, source of our joy.

To thee we, night and day,
Erring children of Adam and Eve,
Lift our voice in supplication,
In groans and grief and tears.

Such are some of the proofs, gleaned from various sources, of the love which the people of Scotland, like those of all Catholic nations, bore towards the Blessed Mother of their Redeemer. Doubtless with greater research many more might be gathered, though these will serve their purpose. The devotion of centuries, the honor intended by fervent donors to witness their love in after ages—though neglected and forgotten by faithless descendants—must surely bear fruit. It would seem, indeed, that the seed sown so long ago is already showing blossom. Turn to the Catholic Directory for Scotland for proof. In the six dioceses which the country has possessed since the restoration of her hierarchy, as many as eighty-two churches at least will be found to rejoice in Our Lady as titular, either alone or in conjunction with another heavenly patron. Some of these, too, may be said to be the resuscitation of ancient Catholic dedications. Thus Aberdeen has still its cathedral of St. Mary; Dundee, Stirling, Haddington, Inverness, Selkirk, Jedburgh, Irvine, Banff, Leith, Kelso, Paisley, New Abbey, Maybole, Hamilton, Lanark and Dumfries can all boast of a church or chapel of Our Lady to replace the shrines of old. Edinburgh has its St. Mary's Cathedral, Glasgow its three churches under her patronage, Motherwell and Musselburgh their sanctuaries, Perth its beautiful shrine of Our Lady of Perpetual Succor, dominating the town once belonging to Mary by a thousand titles. The old Chapel of the Garioch lives again in the title of the church at Fetternear;

the ecclesiastical College of St. Mary at Blairs has replaced the Catholic foundation of Bishop Elphinstone in Aberdeen; St. Mary's at Fochabers, Speyside, revives the memories of Our Lady of Grace.

Mary has indeed come back to Scotland, even though her presence is ignored by so many thousands of the Scottish nation. Her name is lovingly and daily invoked for the conversion of Scotland, her images publicly honored, her altars rise again on every side. We may surely hope that the prayers poured forth and the Masses offered in her honor during the ages of faith, combined with the lasting worship paid her by her loyal children during centuries of persecution and ridicule and contempt, are beginning now to draw down from heaven more abundant showers of grace, and will in God's good time be still more fully answered in the return of the people of the land to the faith they once cherished so dearly.

MICHAEL BARRETT, O. S. B.

St. Benedict's Abbey, Fort-Augustus.

ANCIENT COMMERCE OF THE PHŒNICIANS IN THE MEDITERRANEAN.

PART I.

NO SEA has witnessed more vicissitudes in the history of the civilized world than the Mediterranean, by whose shores the empires of Aryan, Semite and Hamite nations have at various periods flourished and declined, the crumbling ruins of which still prove to the archæologist their former greatness. The best known are Greece and Rome, but they were not the first empires whose shores were washed by the blue waters of the Mediterranean—

"The wild sea, that moans with memories."¹

Professor McCurdy says: "We are learning more clearly as each year of discovery goes by that what the Greeks and Romans were as civilizers and conquerors of a world we still call ancient, the Babylonians were to countries and peoples of an antiquity immeasurably more remote."² Again, "[recent research] seems to supply some ground for the conjecture of Professor Sergi and others that the southern shore of the Mediterranean was the home of a civilization far surpassing in antiquity anything that Carthaginian or Roman brought with them."³

¹ "Spanish Gypsy" (G. Elliot).

² "History, Prophecy and the Monuments," Vol. I., p. 185.

³ *Athenæum*, Sept. 6, 1902.

It would be interesting to learn something of the people who first brought civilization to the western Mediterranean and first crossed its untraversed waters. In ages long anterior to Abraham and Moses it was the highway of commerce for the East (Babylonia, Egypt, etc.); the prophets spoke of Tyre and Sidon as the market of the known world,⁴ and Scripture contains frequent references to the wealth of their merchants and the vast scale of their commerce. "They (the Phœnicians) taught international trade and navigation to the Greeks and then to the Romans. . . . The surviving [Aryan] empires only reached their gigantic stature by climbing on the shoulders of these Semitic adventurers. Not only were the Phœnicians the originators of a world-wide trade and of a far-sighted commercial policy unrivaled in ancient times, but their maritime supremacy has been the most enduring known to men."⁵

The beginnings of navigation lie beyond all human memory. The poet, Horace,⁶ thus praises the daring of the first man, who in a frail bark ventured out of sight of land:

Illi robur et aes triplex
Circa pectus erat, qui fragilem trunci
Commisit pelago ratem
Primus, nec timuit praecliptem Africum. . .

It is not hard to understand how the ancients attributed this to the Phœnicians, whose skill as seamen was never matched by the ancient people before or after them. At all events, the Phœnicians were the first who spread the civilization of the East around the Mediterranean shores.

I.

They were called by the Greek name of *Phoinikes*,⁷ which is probably only a change of the name Punt (Latin, Poeni, Punici), by which the Egyptians designated the populations of South Arabia and the Persian Gulf. Whence did the Phœnicians first come? Considering the great part which the Phœnicians played in the movements of ancient civilization, it is singular how fragmentary are our sources of knowledge for all the most essential elements of

⁴ Isai. xxiii., 1; Jerem. xlvii.; Ezek. xxvi., 27; Amos. i.; Zach. ix., 3. "All the trade-routes from the chief markets of the extreme east, India, Bactriana, Chaldaea, Arabia and the regions of Caucasus, which ran westwards, finally converged on Tyre and Sidon" (Maspéro, *Hist. Ancienne*, p. 235).

⁵ McCurdy, *ibid.*, p. 73.

⁶ Odes I., 3.

⁷ According to Greek tradition, they were so called after Phœnix, son of Agenor, and founder of the race. Others said that Phoiniké simply meant "the red people," whether from living so long on the Persian Gulf (*Mare Erythræum*), or from the dye they manufactured, or from the dark complexion of the race. Others say that it simply means "the country of palm-trees" (from the Greek).

their history. Like the Egyptians, they claimed an antiquity of 30,000 years, yet they retained some memory of having migrated from older seats on an eastern sea. Herodotus⁸ says that the original settlements of the Phœnicians were upon the Erythræan Sea (Persian Gulf), and that they migrated thence at a remote period and transferred their abode to the shores of the Mediterranean. "It was from the wilderness lands of North Arabia that the different families of the Semitic race,⁹ proceeded to the scenes in which they enacted their various histories. The river land between the Tigris and Euphrates was the home of the great Semitic communities during by far the greatest part of the history of the civilized world."¹⁰ At different periods there were migrations of Semites from Mesopotamia westwards, wave after wave, who occupied the fertile plains of Syria or the Mediterranean seaboard. Thus in 2097 B. C. the Kassî, who dwelt in the mountains of Elam, on the eastern frontier of Chaldæa (according to Professor Sayce), invaded Egypt, and for 511 years ruled there as the "Hyksos" (Shepherd) Kings.¹¹ Another and earlier wave of Semitic migration brought this people to the shores of Syria, beyond the Lebanon, where those flourishing merchant cities grew up whose influence upon the world's history was little proportioned to the restricted limits of their territory. We cannot say for certain when this happened. Phœnicia was certainly peopled in the reign of Sargon I. of Akkad (about 3800 B. C.), who ruled an empire extending from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean.

In historical times the Phœnicians called themselves Canaanites, and their land Canaan,¹² "the lowlands," the latter applying equally to the coast, which they themselves occupied, and the inland highlands, which the Israelites occupied. In the cuneiform documents they were included under the name of "Amurri," the Emorites, though in hieroglyphic records Palestine was known as Khar (or Khal) and northern Phœnicia as Zahi. The people themselves were called by the Egyptians Keftiu and sometimes Fenkhu.

II.

Phœnicia extended for 190 miles along the coast, from Arados, or Aroad, on the north to Akko (Acre) in the south, between latitude

⁸ Herod. vii., 89.

⁹ The Semitic race comprised the Assyrians, Babylonians, Aramæans, Arabians, Moabites, Phœnicians and Hebrews.

¹⁰ "Recent Archæol. and Bible" (Nichol), p. 94.

¹¹ Egypt of the Hebrews (Sayce), p. 12; Prof. Flinders Petrie and Dr. T. Pinches agree in asserting their Semitic origin.

¹² Land of Canaan, "Kinakhi," is applied in the Tell-el-Amarna letters of the fourteenth century B. C. to N. Galilee and the Phœnician coast.

33.40 and 35.20 N. Movers¹³ aptly sums up the character of this country: "Phœnicia was not a country; it was a series of ports with a very narrow hinterland." Two mountain ranges, the Lebanon and Anti-lebanon, run parallel to the coast, the former being the eastern boundary of Phœnicia.¹⁴ Between them lies a large valley, watered throughout its length by the river Litani, which, flowing south, falls into the Mediterranean a little above Tyre, and by the Orontes, which flows north for sixty miles and finally rushes into the sea with great violence. Few provinces of the ancient world were as fertile as this deep valley. To the south there are fields of corn and vineyards, which carpet the floor of the valley and extend up the slopes of the mountain as far as the foot could reach. Northwards the deposits of the Orontes produced a black and fertile soil, rich in cereals and every kind of fruit. Hence Coele-Syria, as the Greeks called it, after having in turn supported the Assyrian, Egyptian, Persian and Macedonian conquerors, who held sway over it, finally became under the Romans one of the granaries of the world. The country west of Lebanon is only a strip of land, the average width of which does not exceed 8 or 9 leagues. The left flank of Mount Lebanon is drained by small rivers, flowing swiftly into the sea.

The Phœnician towns, distant about ten or twelve leagues from one another, could only communicate safely with one another by sea. The northernmost town, Aradus, was built on a small island a mile and a half distant from the shore. On the mainland opposite stood Marath and Antarados. A second group of towns were situated near Gebel (the Greek Byblos), which claimed to be the oldest town in the world, having been built by the god El, near the river Adonis. So Gebel and the valley where its river flowed were "a sort of holy land of Adonis, full of temples and monuments consecrated to his cult."¹⁵ Berouth shared with Gebel the glory of having been founded by El.

Some leagues south of Berouth stood Sidon, "first-born of Canaan."¹⁶ The surrounding plain is watered by the "gracious Bostren" (Nahr-el-Aoualy) and laid out with gardens, whence the town received its name of "flowery Sidon." The territory under its sway lay between the rivers Tamour and Litani. South of the

¹³ Die Phönizier, II., Pt. 2, pp. 1-4.

¹⁴ The "Syria" of the Greeks included Phœnicia and Palestine, though originally they applied this name to all the country on the left of the Euphrates. The Arabs call the country Esh-Sham, or "the Left," for it is really the northern, or northwestern, end of the great Arabian peninsula, of which they call the southern side El-Yemen, or "the Right." Syria is derived from *Surt*.

¹⁵ Rénan, "Mission de Phénice."

¹⁶ Gen. x.

Litani, up to Carmel, was the domain of Tyre. Long ages ago (according to Phœnician legends) "the god Samemroum traced on the mainland the plan of a town with dew, opposite which his brother, Hysôos, the first sailor, occupied some islets, where he erected sacred pillars. This was the beginning of Tyre."¹⁷

Both the maritime district, partly under artificial irrigation, and the terraces laid out with great care on the mountain sides were in antiquity in a high state of cultivation, and the country—more especially that portion which lies north of the Litani along the flanks of the Lebanon—still presents some of the richest and most beautiful landscapes in the world, in this respect far excelling the Italian Riviera. With justice Lebanon was often praised by Hebrew writers. Now known as the *Jebel-esh-Sheikh* (the white-headed old man), or *Jebel-el-Tilf* (mountain of ice), it was to Phœnicia at once its protection, the source of its greatness and its crowning beauty. It extended "for a hundred miles with an average elevation of from 6,000 to 8,000 feet, but its frowning precipices and its lofty crest deterred or baffled the invader."¹⁸ . . . This western region it was which held those inexhaustible stores of forest trees that supplied Phœnicia with her warships and her vast commercial navy."¹⁹

For the most part the Lebanon approaches within not many miles of the coast, or even close to it, leaving only a narrow belt of low-land, which from remote antiquity has been traversed by a caravan route. The Phœnicians, thus confined to a territory insufficient to support their population, found themselves compelled by an imperious necessity to seek on the high seas a new country, as it were, and a means of livelihood. Most of the people who then lived along the shores of the Mediterranean were still uncivilized, in that primitive state known as the "Neolithic period," and only used canoes and rafts for fishing. Mr. George Smith says: "Practically early Syria's only opening lay seawards. If she had anything to pour forth of her own or of what she had borrowed from the civilizations on either side of her, this must be the direction of outflow. So some of her tribes, whose race had hitherto been known only as land traders, voyagers of the desert, pushed out from her coasts upon the sea. They found it as studded with islands as the desert is studded with oases, and by means of these they gradually reached the very west of Europe. The first of these islands (Cyprus) is within sight of Syria. . . . Along those islands and coasts the

¹⁷ *Movers*, I., p. 258; II., 1, pp. 131, 501.

¹⁸ We will speak of the Assyrian invasions later. *Maspéro*, however, says that it was from the beginning infested by brigands, *e. g.*, the *Shasou*, or roving Arabs, in the time of *Rameses II.*

¹⁹ *Rawlinson*, "Phœnicia," p. 14.

line of Phœnician voyages can be traced by the deposit of Semitic names, inscriptions and legends. It is not surprising that the early Greek civilization, which they did so much to form, should have given the Phœnicians the fame of inventors. But they were not much more than carriers."²⁰

To the natural advantages of Phœnicia above mentioned must be added the possession of good natural harbors. "Nature has so far assisted man by prompting here a cape and dropping there an islet, that not a few harbors have been formed which have been, and may again become, historical. When we remember that the ships of antiquity were small, propelled by oars and easily beached, we understand how these few advantages were sufficient to bring forth the greatest maritime nation of the ancient world."²¹ South of Carmel the Syrian coast has no natural harbors; this fact explains why Carmel was the southern limit of Phœnician territory, and from thence to Egypt the tribes were mainly agricultural.

By knowing the geographical conditions of their country we can better understand the character of the Phœnicians, as compared with that of their other Semitic kinsmen. Physically they seem to have resembled the Assyrians and Jews, the latter being a younger branch of the Semitic family. "The Jews owned the same blood and speech as the Phœnicians. . . . The language of the Phœnicians was closely related to that of the Hebrews, as German to Dutch, or Portuguese to Spanish."²² But whereas the Jews of later times were cautious and circumscribed in their dealings, the Phœnicians displayed remarkable audacity in enterprise. They seem not to have excelled in originality, like the Egyptians, Assyrians and Greeks, so much as in the power of adapting and improving upon the inventions of others. Thus Herodotus, who admires the learning of the Persians, the science of the Babylonians and the combined learning and science of the Egyptians, limits his commendation of the Phœnicians to their skill in navigation, in mechanics and in works of art.²³ They owed their idea of alphabetic writing to another people, their weights and measures to Babylon, their shipbuilding probably to Egypt, their early architecture and pottery to Assyria, Egypt and early Greece. The adaptability of the Phœnicians was especially shown in their power of ingratiating themselves in the favor of the peoples with whom they came in contact. Thus, they settled in Memphis, in Egypt;²⁴ Tyre had friendly

²⁰ "Hist. Geogr. of Holy Land," chapt. I.

²¹ "Hist. Geogr. of Holy Land," chapt. I.

²² Rawlinson, "Phœnicia."

²³ Herod. I., 1; II., 4, 99, 142; III., 129; Strabo, 16, p. 1,076, etc.

²⁴ Herodotus (II., 112) mentions the Tyrian settlement and shrine of Astarté at Memphis.

relations with Palestine, Babylonia, Assyria and Greece, and we read of the continued alliance between the Phœnicians and Israelites.²⁵ When Egypt or Assyria fought against the peoples of Chanaan the Phœnicians conciliated them by costly gifts and tribute.

As all extant accounts of this people were written by their enemies, it is not easy to test the truth of any statements as to their commercial honesty. Among the Romans "*perfidia Punica*" was a synonym for the basest treachery,²⁶ while among the Greeks "*Phœnician deceit*" had passed into a proverb. Was this unenviable reputation simply due to the jealousy of unsuccessful rivals? The connection of trading and dishonesty is not indeed a novelty; nor was it an accident that the word *kapelos* in Greek meant both retail dealer and rogue. Thus in a fragment of Sophocles occurs the phrase:

"He's a Phœnician, a Sidonian huckster!"

Facts seem to show that in their commercial dealings, at least, their standard of honesty varied with their customers. With civilized nations like Babylonia they were of necessity scrupulously honest, but with untutored natives like the Spaniards there was no limit to their cruelty and extortion.²⁷

Perhaps the Phœnicians in some way repaid such ill-gotten gains by the knowledge they spread of Eastern civilization. The profound influence of Phœnicia on Greece is shown in many ways—in the names of the letters, of many vegetables, metals and wares, and most, though not all, of the religion she conveyed. The exact debt of Greek religion to Phœnicia will never be known, but the more we learn of both races the more we see how great it was. Myths, rites, morals, all spread westwards and formed some of the earliest constituents of Greek civilization.

III.

The origin and progress of the colonization which changed the Mediterranean into a Phœnician sea are only imperfectly known to us. Phœnician documents relating to this have perished utterly, as well as the works which the writers of the Græco-Roman period composed with their help. Till recently most of our knowledge was gathered from the myths and traditions of the Greeks. The

²⁵ III. Kings xl., 1; xvi., 31; Ezra iii., 7; Isaias xxiii., 15-18.

²⁶ Cf. Livy xxi., 4. "*In eo . . . perfidia plus quam Punica*"—a trait of Hannibal. In xlii., 49, he compares Roman straightforwardness with the "*versutiae Poenorum . . . apud quos fallere hostem, quam vi superare, gloriosius fuit.*"

²⁷ Cf. Hdt. i., 1, and Hom. Odyssey, xiv., xv. Thucydides (i., 8) describes them as simply pirates; but perhaps he could not distinguish between lawful and unlawful gain.

priests of the god Melgarth (the Tyrian Hercules) told Herodotus that "the temple had been built at the same time as Tyre itself;"²⁸ now they had dwelt there for 2,300 years." This calculation brings us to the year 2700 B. C., a period which synchronizes with the twelfth Egyptian dynasty.

But the monuments of the two oldest civilizations of the world, Babylonia and Egypt,²⁹ indicate the probability of an earlier date for the beginnings of Phœnician activity, for they reveal the existence of a widespread commerce by land and sea many centuries before this date. The use of bronze³⁰ (copper with an alloy of tin) in early times shows that commerce was already very extensive, for the nearest place whence tin could be obtained was the Caucasus, and that only with great peril and difficulty. But who were the pioneers of navigation in the Mediterranean?

In the earliest ages of Egyptian history commerce was carried on by sea. Tombs and vases of the pre-dynastic period have been discovered (dating from 6000 B. C.), whereon large ships, sometimes with as many as sixty oars, are depicted, that traded with the "Haûi-nibû," the people beyond the seas, who dwelt in the islands of the "Uaz-ûr" (Mediterranean) and brought foreign pottery and gold to Egypt.³¹ Cedar wood must have been always imported into Egypt, even in the age of the Pyramids (4000 B. C.). "Beads of amber are still found near Abydos in the tombs of the oldest necropolis (3500 B. C.), and we may well ask how many hands they had passed through before reaching the banks of the Nile from the shores of the Baltic. Some, at all events, of the wood required for building . . . such as pine, cypress or cedar, was brought from the forests of Lebanon or those of Amanus."³² Whether these wares were first imported by the Egyptians themselves or through the Phœnicians cannot be decided from the available evidence. Dr. A. Evans says: "Maritime enterprise did not begin on the harborless coasts of Palestine. The island-world of the Ægean was the natural home of primitive navigation." (*Times*, September 18, 1896.) The opinion of Professor Petrie seems most probable, who

²⁸ Sidon was the chief town of Phœnicia till its destruction, about 1200 B. C. Hence Herodotus (viii., 67) ranks it before Tyre, and Isalas (xxiii., 12) calls Tyre "daughter of Sidon," because peopled by Sidonian refugees.

²⁹ Prof. Hilprecht (*Babylonian Expedition of Penns. Univ.*, I, pt. 2, p. 24) dates the beginnings of Babylonian civilization between 6000 and 7000 B. C. Likewise, Sayce dates the founding of Eridu from 6000 B. C., while Prof. Flinders Petrie fixes the dawn of Egyptian civilization (his o-Dynasty period) at about 7000 B. C.

³⁰ In Egypt called *tehset* and *xomt*. Assy. *nuksu*, Hebr. *nekoset*.

³¹ *Encycl. Brit.* (1902), art. "Egyptology."

³² Maspéro, "Dawn of Civilization" (1901), p. 392. "The Egyptians used bronze from the Fourth Dynasty downwards (B. C. 4000), side by side with pure copper."

concludes thus: "The most likely thing is that the Mediterranean people always were familiar with shipping, and whichever civilized soonest—probably Libyans—started the commercial traffic." We have no proof, he adds, as to who manned the prehistoric ships mentioned above, or when the Phœnicians first engaged in this commerce. The earliest mention of a voyage from the Phœnician coast occurs in the Babylonian tablets, when Sargon I., about 3800 B. C., crossed to the "land in the midst of the sea of the setting sun," *i. e.*, Cyprus—probably in Phœnician ships.³³ Probably, therefore, as Professor McCurdy says, Phœnician commercial activity began about 4000 years B. C., and previous to that time whatever commerce had been carried on in the eastern Mediterranean had been in the hands of the Libyans, Tahonou.

The earliest reference in the Bible to them occurs in the blessing of Jacob (Gen. xlix.), "Zebulon shall dwell at the haven of the sea, and he shall sojourn in ships; and his border shall be unto Sidon." The date of this is about 1850 B. C.

Egyptian monuments first mention them in the time of the eighteenth dynasty. Aahmes, founder of this dynasty, conquered Syria as far as Zahi about 1600 B. C. By this time Phœnician trade must have been very greatly developed, and the common use of bronze (containing ten per cent. of tin) proves that the Phœnician seafarers had already gone very far afield.³⁴ Tahutmes III., who reigned in Egypt from 1503 to 1449 B. C., was master of all Phœnicia, and in the lists of places conquered by him and engraved on the walls of the temple at Karnak occur Onedeshu (Kadesh on the Orontes), Demesqu (Damascus), Japu (Joppa), Oarman (Carmel). Among the people depicted bringing tribute to him are "the princes of the land of Keftu (Phœnicia) and of the islands in the great sea." The Sidonians prudently submitted to him and propitiated him with gifts rather than imperil their vast commerce by a useless resistance. The copious "Annals of Tahutmes III." will give some idea of the great wealth of the Phœnicians at this time;³⁵ and though history is silent about them from the time of Sargon I., King of Babylon,

³³ Cuneiform Inscript. of W. Asia, IV., 34, 24-26. The Lybians (Tahonou, as the Egyptians called them), comprising the Lebu and other tribes, dwelt in North Africa, and, with the islanders of the Mediterranean, were called the Tamehu, or the fair race, to distinguish them from the Egyptians, 'Aamu (Semites) and Negroes. These four races of mankind are depicted in the Tombs of the Kings.

³⁴ It is impossible in a small space to explain fully the proof of the antiquity of commerce from the use of bronze. The amount of tin used for it increased with the development of commerce. Probably from its Sanskrit name, *kastfra*, tin was brought at a very early period from Malay to India and Babylonia by Arab traders, who called it "*kasdeer*."

³⁵ Cf. Flinders Petrie, "History of Egypt," II., pp. 103-125. Also his "Syria and Egypt."

to that of the patriarch, Jacob—a space of about 2,000 years—the numerous works of art mentioned in these Annals show the high degree of civilization which they had attained.

The Tell-el-Amarna tablets give us a picture of Canaan in the century which preceded the exodus of the Israelites out of Egypt and testify to the enormous wealth of Phœnicia at this time, when it was under the protection of Egypt. Professor Sayce says: "When Khu-n-aten was Pharaoh (about 1380 B. C.) the cities of Canaan were numerous and wealthy. The people were highly cultured and excelled especially as workers in gold and silver, as manufacturers of porcelain and vari-colored glass and as weavers of richly-dyed linen. Their merchants already traded to distant parts of the known world."³⁶ According to Petrie, "the civilization of Syria at this time was equal, if not superior, to that of Egypt."

It was during this period of Egyptian suzerainty that Sidon reached the zenith of her prosperity. Cyprus (Khittim) had been the first island they had colonized, probably when Sidon was founded. Thence coasting along Asia Minor they came to Rhodes and Crete, which formed the gateway of the Grecian archipelago. There the purple fisheries attracted the Phœnicians to Itanos; Lappa and Knôsos in the north, Arad, Gortyna and Lebene in the south were occupied or founded.³⁷ Cythera at the entrance of the Gulf of Laconia, scarcely three miles from the mainland, was a port of call for their vessels bound for Italy or Sicily. The "murex," or shell fish, whence they obtained "the purple of the islands" (Ezek. xxvii., 7) was so abundant there that at one time Cythera was termed "the purple isle." The Phœnicians formed a settlement there and built a shrine to Astarté, the first perhaps ever erected in Greece.³⁸ There are traces of Phœnician occupation at Antiparos, Ios and Syros, in the south Ægean. They opened the rich silver mines of the isles of Siphnos and Cimolos. Further north the isle of Thasos, opposite Thrace, served as a depôt for the gold mines of Mount Pangæus on the mainland; and the traces of them ten centuries later excited the wonder of Herodotus.³⁹

Passing through the Hellespont and Bosphorus, they dared in their frail barks to brave the storms of the Euxine (Black Sea), and freighted their ships with the produce of the coast regions, finally coming to Colchis, whence they brought the precious metals, which Greek legend symbolized in the myth of the Argonauts and the Golden Fleece—gold from Colchian rivers and the Arimaspians coun-

³⁶ "Egypt of the Hebrews," p. 69.

³⁷ *Movers, Die Phönizier*, II., pt. 2, pp. 258-261.

³⁸ *Hdt.* I., 105; *Pausanias* I., 15, 5; III., 23, 1.

³⁹ *Hdt.* VI., 47.

try, tin from Caucasus,⁴⁰ silver and lead and iron from the Chalybes, which they also brought overland across Armenia, besides tunnies and sardines from the coast fisheries.

At the same time Sidonian merchants also visited the coast of Epirus and Southern Italy. Melos, opposite Laconia, produced sulphur, alum and "Melian earth." There were murex fisheries at Nisyra and Gyaros. All these island depôts were less easy to attack and more capable of defense than stations on the mainland of Greece or Asia. Yet there are traces of their settlements in Greece itself, at Ægina, Salamis, Argolis, Attica and the Isthmus of Corinth. None of these survived the "Dorian invasion," but their presence amid the pre-Homeric peoples of Greece had a lasting influence on Hellenic religion. Traces of their stay appear in the tombs of Mycenæ, where Phœnician idols, amber beads and ostrich eggs were found side by side with gold ornaments of "Mycenæan" style. Thus, too, the rock tombs of Hymettus closely resemble those of Phœnicia, and we find, at Corinth, the worship of the Tyrian Melgarth under the name of Melicertes.

But the Sidonians could not enjoy the monopoly of Mediterranean commerce forever. Egyptian monuments of the time of Seti I. (about 1327 B. C.) record the confederation of "Pelagian" nations, who formed a great fleet to invade Egypt. Among these nations are mentioned the "Pelasgæ"⁴¹ and the Lebu (Libyans) of North Africa. They were repulsed from Egypt, but settled in the Ægean Isles and seriously harassed Phœnician commerce. The Sidonian settlements in the Ægean fell one after another, except Thasos in the north, Melos and Thera in the Cyclades, Cythera and Rhodes. The Homeric poems, which treat of this period, show the Phœnicians passed from the condition of masters of the sea to that of simple merchants. Hence they were compelled to seek new markets in the west—in North Africa, Malta and Sicily, where they already had colonies at Ziz (Panormus), Motya, Kepher (Solonté), Rosh Melgarth and Eryx. From Sicily two routes lay before them—going north they came to Sardinia, with its silver mines, and the Balearic Isles; or coasting along North Africa, they came to the Straits of Gibraltar. The Balearic Isles served as a depôt for the products of Spain, the modern Port Mahon being one of the best ports in the Mediterranean. This shifting of the seat of their commerce is referred to by M. Arnold:

As some grave Tyrian trader from the sea
Descried at sunrise an emerging prow . . .

⁴⁰ *Movers*, II., pt. 2, pp. 297-308.

⁴¹ The "Pelasgæ" were one of the chief races inhabiting Greece in pre-Homeric times. All the maritime enemies of Egypt belonged to the Tamehu, or "white race" (Aryans).

Among the Ægean isles;
 And saw the merry Grecian coaster come . . .
 And knew the intruders on his ancient home,
 The young, light-hearted masters of the waves;
 And snatched his rudder and shook out more sail,
 And day and night held on indignantly
 O'er the blue midland waters with the gale,
 Betwixt the Syrtes and soft Sicily,
 To where the Atlantic raves
 Outside the Western Straits, and unbent sails . . .
 And on the beach undid his corded bales.⁴²

This great maritime migration was one epoch in what is known as the "Mycenæan civilization," which prevailed in Greece and the Ægean Isles from about the seventeenth to the twelfth century before Christ. "Mycenæan civilization" is a convenient epithet for a certain phase of a prehistoric civilization which as a whole is often called "Ægean." Some common influence spread at a certain period over the whole Ægean area and reduced almost to identity a number of local civilizations of similar origin but diverse development. Argos, Mycenæ, Attica, Thebes, etc., in Greece, and the Ægean Isles have been proved by the excavations of Dr. A. Evans and others in recent years to be prolific in the remains of this prehistoric period out of all proportion to the remains of classical Hellenic culture, which latter it preceded by a long interval of time. The discovery of "Mycenæan" tombs, vases, weapons, etc., reveal the different stages of this civilization, which till the researches of Dr. Schliemann in 1876 at Hissarlik (Troy) and Mycenæ was conveniently known as the "Heroic Age" of Greece, and about which so many "legends" had been written by Greek writers. The closing period of this prehistoric civilization is depicted for us in the poems of Homer—Agamemnon, King of Mycenæ, "rules over Argive land and many isles" (Il. ii, 108), the "Argive land" being Peloponnesus—and it was finally eclipsed by the descent of northern tribes into Greece about 1100 B. C., remembered by the Greeks as the "Dorian invasion." The question as to who were the authors of this "Mycenæan civilization" has not yet been answered. The claims of Pelasgians, Carians, Achæans, Danaans, etc., have been successively proposed, but so far no conclusion has been generally accepted.

⁴² From "the Scholar Gypsy." This change is preserved for us in the Phœnician legend of Melgarth voyaging round the Mediterranean and conquering Spain. On this tradition, which sums up roughly the main features of Phœnician colonization, many local traditions were engrafted, e. g., those of Kinyras, Europa, Cadmus visiting Cyprus, Rhodes, etc., the labors of Hercules, the brazen Talos in Crete, the eight children of Helios in Rhodes, etc. It is partly owing to these legends that we can conjecture the lost history of their discoveries, and also of the "Mycenæan" peoples, who occupied Greece in prehistoric times. As Bacon long ago pointed out, "the writings that relate these fables being not delivered as inventions of the writers, but as things before believed and received, appear like a soft whisper from the traditions of more ancient nations, conveyed through the flutes of the Grecians."

Mr. Hogarth says: "We can hardly question that the early peoples, whom the Greeks knew as Pelasgi, Leleges, Dania, Carians, and so forth, shared in it. But were they its authors? And who, after all, were they themselves? The Greeks believed them their own kin, but what value can we attach to the belief of an age to which scientific ethnology and archæology were unknown? . . . The fabric and decoration of the tombs discovered in Crete, Cyprus, Mycenæ, etc., is not that of any well-known art, Egyptian, Assyrian and Babylonian."⁴³ And again: "We know at least Ægean civilization was not. It was *not* the disguised product of any of the Eastern peoples with which we have been long acquainted, least of all of the Phœnician Semites."

One result of these discoveries has been to restore faith in the authority of the Greek writers who treat of prehistoric times, and to prove that about these times Herodotus, Thucydides, Pausanias, etc., wrote substantial truth. Thus Thucydides (i., 4) tells us how the Phœnicians were driven from the Ægean by Minos, King of Crete, who became master of the Cyclades and the Hellenic sea and put down piracy on the seas. He lived in the best period of prehistoric Cretan civilization (fourteenth and fifteenth centuries B. C.).⁴⁴

It is impossible at present to say what influence the Phœnicians had on this "Mycenæan" civilization. They only established depôts on the Ægean coasts, which served as ports of call for their vessels, while the islands themselves were occupied by the peoples, to whom the "Mycenæan" art is due. Mr. Hogarth says: "As for the Phœnicians, for whom on the strength of the Homeric tradition a strong plea has been put forward, it cannot be said to be impossible that some objects, thought to be Mycenæan, are of Sidonian origin. The only scripts known to have been used in the Mycenæan area and period are in no way affiliated to the Phœnician alphabet, and neither the characteristic forms nor the characteristic style of Phœnician art, as we know it, appear in Mycenæan products."

The mention here of the Phœnician alphabet leads us to inquire as to its origin. We know that the Greeks of historical times received their alphabet from the Phœnicians, which unanimous tradition connects with the name of Cadmus, the mythic founder of Thebes. Till recently de Rougé's opinion was generally admitted that the Phœnician letters were derived from the Hieratic writing of the Egyptians, which the Phœnicians communicated to the Greeks. But recent excavations seem to favor Professor Petrie's

⁴³ Cf. *Encycl. Brit.* (XXXI.), on "Mycenæan Civilization."

⁴⁴ Cf. *Hdt.* II., 122. The splendid palace and tombs at Knôsos, recently discovered by Dr. A. Evans, confirm the testimony of Thucydides.

view of its origin—that out of a large body of symbols in use from prehistoric times around the shores of the Mediterranean the Phœnicians specialized as alphabetic signs those which they had utilized as numerals, and that this specialization was the starting point of the alphabet as we know it. The use as numerals “would soon render these signs as invariable in order as our own numerals and force the use of them on all countries with which the Phœnicians traded. Hence, before long these signs drove out of use all others, except in the less changed civilization of Asia Minor and Spain. This exactly explains the phenomena of the early Greek alphabets, many in variety . . . yet entirely uniform in order.”⁴⁵

Perhaps when scholars have deciphered the Mycenæan scripts lately discovered we may learn what share the Phœnicians had in that civilization, with which they must have been long acquainted. By 1150 B. C., when Rameses III. was Pharaoh, the power of Egypt was waning and she was forced to withdraw her garrisons from Syria, thus leaving the Phœnician cities entirely unprotected. A Philistine fleet, setting out from Ascalon, defeated the Phœnician squadron, and then attacked Sidon, which they almost entirely destroyed. The Sidonians fled to Tyre, which thenceforward became the chief town of the Phœnicians.

But their commerce with the west still flourished. In Spain, beyond the Straits of Gibraltar, was the country of Tartessus, one of the most productive regions of the ancient world. Their oldest colonies seem to have been Sax (Motril) and Onoba. About 1100 a Tyrian squadron planted a colony at Gadir (now Cadiz), which from its splendid position soon became the centre of Phœnician settlements in Spain, Carteia (Algesiras), Malaca (Malaga), Abdera (Almeria). The untutored natives of Spain had little idea of the value of the metals; for long there was no competition, and so the profits were enormous. It was said that even the anchors were of silver in ships returning from Spain. Amber, too, was brought in very early times from the Baltic regions. Amber ornaments are often mentioned by Homer, and have been found in the oldest tombs of Cumæ and in those by the Lions' gate at Mycenæ. The Phœnicians took measures to prevent other merchants having access to the regions with which they carried on their most lucrative business. Their deliberate efforts to keep secret the source of their supplies of amber and frankincense help to account for the geographical ignorance displayed in earlier Greek writers (*e. g.*, Herodotus iii., 115). The gruesome tales of the Laestrygonæ and Cyclopes and Symple-

⁴⁵ “Royal Tombs,” I., p. 32. The oldest Greek inscriptions (of the seventh century B. C.) were found in the Isle of Thera by Gärtringen in 1896. St. Beuno's College, North Wales.

gades—as well as those of Circe, Scylla and Charybdis—were not improbably largely invented to deter the Greeks from sailing into the Black Sea or the western Mediterranean. The Greeks of later generations were apt to call these fables "Phœnician lies."

But we have already exceeded the limits of a single article. As Vergil says:

Immensum spatium confecimus æquor;
Et jam tempus equum fumantia solvere colla.

In another article we hope to continue this account of Phœnician commerce till it received its deathblow in the fall of Tyre, 332 years before the Christian era.

J. D. MURPHY, S. J.

St. Bueno's College, North Wales.

SOME REMARKS ON BISHOP DOANE'S ARTICLE IN THE "NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW" FOR APRIL, 1905.

BISHOP DOANE, the Episcopal Bishop of Albany, has written an article for the April number of the *North American Review* on "Remarriage after Divorce: The Practice of the Roman Church Contrasted with Its Theory." The writer's high standing among his co-religionists will at once attract attention, and his words are likely to have weight with those of his creed. Many will read his article out of curiosity or with the hope of finding therein new strength in their desire to put down divorce. But Catholics will rise from its perusal with the conviction that outside of the Catholic Church we look in vain for a remedy against the great evil that is desolating our land and polluting the fountains of human life. In the article the Catholic will also see the incredible anomaly of an apparently sincere man who, having Catholic authors like Gury and Thein before him, is utterly senseless to the meaning of Catholic teaching and boldly states without fear of contradiction what is sheer falsehood.

The reason why the Catholic Church is different to all others is because she alone is the Church of Christ; she alone the dispenser of the sacraments, and hence she alone has the right to determine the hindrances to marriage. For Christian marriage is a sacrament. The contract is the marriage. Hence the contract is the sacrament. Now it is the Church's power, and hers alone, to judge cases that touch the validity of the sacraments; hence hers alone to judge of cases that touch the contract of matrimony, which is a sacrament.

Moreover, civil society can, by demanding certain formalities, invalidate natural contracts entered into without them. *A fortiori* then can the Church determine and define when this contract, which Christ Himself committed to her care, is valid. "He therefore," says Leo XIII. in his great encyclical on Christian marriage, "having renewed marriages to such and so great excellence, commended and entrusted all the discipline bearing upon them to His Church. And the Church has exercised this power over Christian marriage in every clime and every age; she has so used it as to show that it was her own, not granted by man, but from on high by her Founder's will. And she has walled this institution round about by such power and the provident enactment of such divine laws that no one can be a fair judge without seeing that in this point of marriage the best guardian and protector of the human race is the Church, whose wisdom has triumphed over time's flight and man's injustice and the countless vicissitudes of public events. We must confess, then, that ever intent on protecting the sanctity and perpetuity of marriage, the Catholic Church has merited well of the nations of the world."

After making a series of statements about the last General Convention of his Church and forecasting the future opinions of many Episcopalians on the question of divorce, the Bishop begins his attack on the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church. "That Church," he says, "is in a perfectly different position towards this whole subject from any other religious body in the world because she claims two things: the power to annul a marriage or rather to declare it void *ab initio*, and secondly to dispense with certain hindrances to marriage." We have given above the real reason why the Church is different from all other religious bodies. It is simply because she alone is the Church of Christ; to her alone was given the guardianship of the matrimonial contract between Christians which is a sacrament, and she has exercised this power from immemorial ages. But apart from this the Bishop's statement is misleading. First, the Church does not claim the power to annul every marriage; she has no power to annul a Christian marriage that has been consummated, or the marriage of infidels as long as both parties remain in infidelity.* Secondly, to annul a marriage is entirely different from declaring it void *ab initio*. In the one case the marriage existed, in the other it did not exist. Again, the Bishop will excuse us for remarking that we always thought a human legislator could dispense in his own laws. Why then cannot the legislating Catholic Church dispense in certain purely ecclesi-

* For the dissolution of *matrimonium ratum et non consummatum*. For the Pauline Privilege, see Gury.

astical laws in particular cases for just reason? Cannot the State create an impediment to a certain contract and afterwards for cogent reasons dispense in individual instances? Is this against the nature of law or in accordance with it? "Stated in practical terms," says Bishop Doane, "the Roman Catholic Church both creates and does away with impediments to marriage." Does the Bishop mean to say that at one and the same time she does both? Surely not! For then there would be no impediments at all. Or does he mean that the Church makes a law which is binding on all the faithful and then when a particular case arises for sufficient cause relaxes the obligation in a given case? And if he thinks that this is an insurmountable difficulty, then we can only say that the good man is poorly read in first principles. When a legislator exempts an individual does he do away with his law as regards the rest of the community? "I am a bit anxious," he adds, "to make myself clear in regard to this matter." We wish he had before he wrote. However, he is very sincere. "I confess to a feeling of more or less uncertainty about my position." As well he might. In one point we confess to a feeling of certainty, namely, that the Bishop is woefully in the wrong as regards our position. The reason the Bishop feels uncertain is because on the one hand he was accused of holding the Roman or rigorist theory, while on the other some Catholics questioned the accuracy of a statement which he made in the address to his own convention that the Roman Church refused divorce, but multiplied possibilities of remarriage by innumerable grounds of dispensation and countless definitions of pre-nuptial sins. It would be more accurate to say pre-nuptial impediments. And these Catholics were only defending their own side from a calumny, for Rome has not multiplied possibilities of remarriage by innumerable grounds of dispensation and countless definitions of pre-nuptial sins. The Bishop does not evidently know anything about the practice of Rome in conceding dispensations. He does not seem to know that a canonical cause which would be sufficient for one would be wholly inadequate for another. He does not reflect that Rome has guarded her right in this matter with the most stringent methods of procedure; that she is ever alive to the slightest danger of laxity and takes cognizance of the danger at once. Briefly, in practice as well as in theory, she guards the sacredness of the marriage tie, even against the assaults of the most exalted rulers of the earth, as no other power can, and has thus won for herself the well-earned fame of being the greatest benefactor of the human race, as Leo XIII. tells us: "As often, indeed, as the Supreme Pontiffs have resisted the most powerful among rulers in their threatening demands that divorces carried out by them should be confirmed by the Church,

so often must we account them to have been contending for the safety, not only of religion, but also of the human race. For this reason all generations of men will admire the proofs of unbending courage which are to be found in the decrees of Nicholas I. against Lothair; of Urban II. and Paschal II. against Philip I. of France; of Clement VII. and Paul III. against Henry VIII., and lastly of Pius VII., that holy and courageous Pontiff, against Napoleon I., when at the height of his prosperity and in the fulness of his power." (Encyclical on Marriage.) And notwithstanding these facts, the fair-minded Bishop rehearses the stories of Louis XII. of France, of Napoleon and even of old Henry VIII.

The Bishop has been in training for this attack on Rome, for he tells us: "I have carefully gone through 'The History of the Council of Trent,' by Pietro Polano, translated by Nathaniel Brent, published in London in 1620, and also 'The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent' in Le Plat's edition, published in Antwerp in 1779. I have also carefully read Gury's 'Compendium of Moral Theology' and a book which is called 'The Ecclesiastical Dictionary,' by the Rev. John Thein, which has the imprimatur of the Roman Catholic Archbishop of New York and the Roman Catholic Archbishop (*sic*) of Cleveland. So that I have done what in me lies to get accurate and authoritative information." Has he? Does he not know that the "*Historia del Concilio Tridentino*," published in London by Pietro Polano, is the work of that arch-enemy of Rome, Parpi; that the London publication was due to the apostate, de Dominis, and that the work was put on the Index because of historical and theological errors contained in it? Is this the way to get accurate information?

"I confess myself confused," he continues, "and convinced of the fact that when in controversy a defender of the Roman system is cornered by one difficulty he can escape through some other opening." Strange cornering that! And what kind of an arguer is he who can corner an opponent and yet cannot keep him in the corner until he cries enough? Now the Bishop enumerates several Tridentine anathemas and closes his account by informing the reader that "it seems pretty difficult to escape from being anathematized under one or other of these various heads." Not very difficult! Faith and the grace of God will suffice to keep one free from all of them. There are millions of Catholics who have never fallen under a single anathema. Then follow some quotations from Father Thein's work.

After making several animadversions on the difficulties Catholics labor under of defending themselves and on a few modern instances, the Bishop comes to a point with which we are much more seriously concerned than any other for the present. Catholics hold that

marriages of baptized persons are sacraments; that one may receive a sacrament without receiving the grace of the sacrament. For instance, an adult who receives baptism without sorrow of heart for his past mortal sins is really baptized, but commits a sacrilege and does not receive the grace of baptism. Catholics hold that baptized heretics receive the sacrament of marriage when they enter the married contract, but that neither Catholics nor heretics receive the grace of this sacrament if they are in the state of mortal sin. To receive the sacrament and the grace of the sacrament are two distinct things; the one, grace, being the effect of the other, the sacrament, is given only to those who do not place a hindrance to this effect. The Bishop says: "I have carefully read Gury's 'Compendium of Moral Theology.'" Now in number 191 in his treatise on the "sacraments in general" Gury teaches that they are divided into *formata vel informia* according as they produce grace when they are received, or, on account of some obstacle [obex], suspend their effect until the hindrance be removed. In chapter fourth [nn. 228, 229, 230] he teaches what is necessary for the valid, and in the second article of the same chapter [n. 231] what is necessary for the licit reception of the sacraments. Treating of the minister of baptism [n. 243], he lays down the principle: "Every human being having the use of reason, man or woman, Catholic or heretic, faithful or infidel, is the extraordinary minister of baptism, so that such a one can *always* baptize validly, and, *in the case of necessity*, licitly." Moreover [n. 248, Q. 5], he says that it is of faith according to the Council of Trent that baptism conferred by a heretic with all the requisites for this sacrament is valid. The subject of the Sacrament of Matrimony [n. 772] is every baptized person who is not bound by an impediment of the natural, divine or canon law, so that heretics and schismatics validly contract marriage and receive the sacrament. And this is confirmed by the practice of the Church, which does not oblige them to renew their consent when they become converts to the Church. According, then, to the Catholic Church marriage is a sacrament which is received validly even by baptized heretics; the sacrament may be validly received without the effect of sanctifying grace. This grace is conferred on all baptized persons who receive the sacrament with souls free from the stain of mortal sin. This being the case, what wonder is it that we were amazed when we read the following sentence: "According to the Roman Church, marriage being a sacrament, and no one being able to receive the grace of the sacrament unless he is a Catholic Christian, it follows that the marriages of persons who are not Roman Catholics are not sacramental and have no sacramental grace or sanctity connected with them." This proposition is

founded on dense ignorance of the teachings of the Church, of the nature of sacraments, of the contents of the very book, Gury, which the Bishop informs us he has carefully read, but which having read he does not understand.

We doubt if it be possible for a sincere man to make more mistakes in a given sentence than did Bishop Doane in the words I have just quoted. But error generates error, and the Bishop is now in full race along his devious path. The Church of God teaches that every valid matrimonial contract between baptized persons is a sacrament; that the one falls with the other. You cannot have a valid contract which is not a sacrament; you cannot have the sacrament which is not a valid contract, whether the contracting persons be Roman Catholics or Episcopalians or what not, if they only be baptized. Marriages, then, of baptized persons who are not Roman Catholics are not "merely legal contracts;" they are a divine institution, elevated by Christ to an altogether supernatural, sacramental dignity. But the Bishop says: "They are simply legal contracts which the law creates and which the same law can dissolve." Whereas the truth is, the law did not create them and cannot dissolve them. Liken further to the good Bishop: "Some Roman theologians hold that if both parties are baptized their marriage is Christian marriage, though they have no grace of the sacraments, unless they are Roman Catholics; but the modern Roman fashion is to rebaptize all converts to Romanism, and so to invalidate all baptism but Roman baptism. So that even when both parties are baptized persons, unless they are Roman Catholics the marriage is merely a legal contract." The Bishop had said that "according to the Roman Church marriage being a sacrament and no one being able to receive the grace of a sacrament unless he is a Catholic Christian, it follows that the marriages of persons who are not Roman Catholics are not sacraments," and now he tells us that "some Roman theologians hold that if both persons are baptized their marriage is Christian marriage, though they have no grace of the sacrament, unless they are Roman Catholics." Now how the Bishop can say that the Roman Church teaches one thing and that some Catholic theologians maintain the contradictory, remaining the while Roman, is a puzzle to the present writer. But the difficulty is not with the Roman Church or her theologians, but with the good Bishop, who is romanticizing and evolving his own spectacular theories as to Roman doctrine from erroneous notions of the Catholic teaching on the sacraments. He is altogether wrong in the first sentence; he is altogether wrong in the second sentence of this paragraph. What wonder is it that he misstates the fact in the first part of the third sentence, for all Roman theologians hold

that marriages contracted by baptized persons who are not bound by diriment impediments are sacraments whether they be Catholics or heretics, and that the sacrament may be received by the same without the effect of grace. The Bishop goes on: "But the modern Roman fashion is to rebaptize all converts to Romanism, and so to invalidate all baptism but Roman baptism." We had an idea that there was but *one* baptism; that it was of faith that baptism conferred by a heretic with all the essential requisites was a valid baptism; that nothing on earth could invalidate it. Baptism is necessary for salvation, and hence whenever there is a reasonable doubt as to the validity of the former baptism the sacrament is repeated conditionally; and in general the more necessary the sacrament is, the less grave is the doubt which would justify its repetition. Now this conditional baptism has nothing at all to do with the validity of the former sacrament. The priest's intention is to baptize only on condition that the person is not already baptized; it is not his intention to baptize if the person has been baptized. Consequently he does not invalidate the former baptism, and in this point, too, the good Bishop does not understand Catholic theology.

The method followed in the reception of converted heretics is a very simple one: "Investigation must be made in each individual case as regards the validity of the baptism received in heresy. If on examination it is found out that no baptism was conferred, or that it was conferred invalidly, the converts are to be baptized absolutely; if a probable doubt remains, then they are to be baptized conditionally; finally, if it is clear that the baptism was valid, they simply make the profession of faith. Now a doubtful baptism as regards the validity of the marriage is to be considered as valid. The question of the doubtful baptism of a heretic has been answered time upon time by the Sacred Congregations in this sense. In the face of all this, what judgment is to be made of the following sentence? "So that even when both parties to a marriage are baptized persons, unless they are Roman Catholics the marriage is merely a legal contract." It is not; it is a sacrament, and this is the teaching of the Catholic Church. The Bishop continues: "Whatever difference there may be as to theory, the practical fact is that Rome regards as dissoluble the marriages of all unbaptized persons, marriages between an unbaptized person and a baptized Christian who is not a Roman Catholic, marriages between a Roman Catholic and a non-Romanist, baptized or unbaptized, which has been contracted without dispensation." And the Bishop is rash enough to say: "If this is true, and I believe it cannot be denied, it certainly follows that Rome cannot proclaim herself the special guardian of the institution of marriage." Now let us see. Rome does not hold that all

marriages of unbaptized persons are dissoluble, but that they are intrinsically and extrinsically indissoluble as long as both parties remain in infidelity. Rome holds that marriages contracted between baptized and unbaptized persons without dispensation are no marriages at all; that marriages between a Roman Catholic and baptized non-Romanist with or without dispensation are intrinsically indissoluble and once consummated can be dissolved by no power on earth. So that what the Bishop says is not true. He could have found the Roman teaching in the Council of Trent and in Gury. He might well have spent his time in learning what our theory and practice is, and if he had done so, he would not have been led into these errors. Misrepresentation may blind unthinking men, but it will open the eyes of the thoughtful to the deplorable condition of the Protestant doctrine of marriage.

He is afraid that Rome's marriage laws will work evil in our land. But the Bishop would do well to read with care the great Pontiff Leo's letter on this whole question of marriage. We quote the following:

"In the great confusion of opinions, however, which day by day is spreading more and more widely it should further be known that no power can dissolve the bond of Christian marriage, whenever this has been ratified and consummated; and that of a consequence those husbands and wives are guilty of a manifest crime who plan, for whatever reason, to be united in a second marriage before the first one has been ended by death."

The Plenary Councils of Baltimore speak in like terms. There never was a time when Rome did not cry aloud at the least sign of danger, no matter whence it came. And the present writer believes that there are few serious educated Protestants to-day in this country who do not in their hearts admit that Rome is the staunchest defender of the marriage bond. Rome and divorce! They are deadly foes. Rome and the marriage tie! The voice of the one has ever safeguarded the sanctity of the other. But the Bishop is disturbed by the law of impediments, dispensations, and so forth. Is the Bishop in earnest? Is he blind to the immense good that follows to the human race in consequence of them? Take, for instance, consanguinity. Why does the Church forbid marriages among blood relations to the fourth degree? In order that Christian charity and conjugal love may be more widely diffused. Surely it makes much for the welfare of society that marriage be permitted only among those who are not bound by the ties of kinship. Does it not safeguard the moral law and hold that familiarity, which naturally exists among relatives, within its proper bounds, when they know that they may not be united in lawful wedlock? Is it

not conducive to the physical well-being and development of the race? Are not unions of blood relatives often fruitless? Is not the offspring frequently physically degenerate and mentally deranged? "Is it not also," says Leo XIII., "a great blessing that for the purpose of spreading more widely the supernatural love of husbands and wives, she [the Church] has decreed marriages within certain degrees of consanguinity or affinity to be null and void; that she has taken the greatest pains to safeguard marriage, as much as possible, from error and violence and deceit; that she has always wished to preserve the holy chasteness of the marriage bed, personal rights, the honor of husband and wife and the security of religion?" These are some of the reasons why she has established impediments, and these appeal to every right-thinking man.

Ah! but those dispensations! There's the rub! In certain impediments dispensation is *never* given; these are, defect of consent, substantial error, violence or fear, a valid existing marriage, consanguinity in the straight line and in the first degree of the collateral line, affinity in the first degree of the straight line when it arises from lawful wedlock. There are other impediments in which dispensation is *hardly ever* granted—thus certain classes of the impediment of crime—sacred orders. There are still others in which dispensation is granted, but only for *very grave* causes; thus the second degree of consanguinity, especially when it touches the first degree, spiritual relationship between the one who baptizes and the one baptized, a certain case of crime, defect of age, clandestinity. For the other cases less grave causes suffice. What is the practice of Rome and her Catholic children? Do the faithful as a body observe these laws or not? Let the Bishop look around him and he will see that they do. Catholics as a rule do not marry when they fall under these laws. The practice of the faithful is in keeping with legislation. But does not Rome dispense? She does in exceptional instances, and thereby proves her inherent wisdom and prudence. For cases may arise in which the superior may consider himself bound to relax the obligation of the law as regards a certain individual, while it still binds the rest of the community. And in this way the common good itself is safeguarded. For the welfare of the pact redounds to the common weal and the legislator must look out for the community, yet so as to have care, too, of the individual members, and thus he should dispense to relieve their distress in given cases. When a law which works for the well-being of the community prevents the good of this or that private person because of some imminent danger or greater benefit which is impossible of attainment on account of the law, then indeed to dispense helps on the whole body and is just.

And here in passing be it said that the Bishop is a little hazy in his notions when he tells us that Rome multiplies possibilities of remarriage by innumerable grounds of dispensation and countless definitions of prenuptial sins or prenuptial impediments. When the Church dispenses, she makes it possible for parties to marry who could not marry before, to elicit a valid consent which they could not do before. How this multiplies the possibilities of remarriage may be clear to the Bishop—we confess it is a mystery to us. The dispensation does not make remarriage, but marriage possible. Or probably the Bishop means that parties who, for example, through ignorance of the existence of the impediment, went through the form of marriage, may now by dispensation have their marriage revalidated; if so, surely this is a blessing, and such a possibility realized in fact is most devoutly to be wished for; and, let me whisper it into the ear of the Bishop, is the constant endeavor of every priest when he finds a couple thus situated. If the Bishop only knew how pastors labor for this end! Let me repeat it, nothing is left undone to revalidate marriages by dispensation and renewal of consent or by sanating them *in radice*. The Bishop does not hesitate to exaggerate. Rome multiplies possibilities of remarriage by innumerable grounds of dispensation and countless definitions of prenuptial sins. It would be more accurate to say prenuptial impediments."

Though diriment impediments are of their nature prenuptial, we are somewhat at a loss to grasp the identity between them and prenuptial sins. When two in good faith contract in ignorance of the impediment which binds them, their conjugal life is not necessarily sinful. Because sin is a voluntary transgression of the law. These know nothing of the law as it binds them, and consequently they commit no sin. If, on the other hand, with malice prepense and knowledge, two such persons endeavor to contract without dispensation, this is a sin, their life is sinful, but surely their sin is due to their own bad will and not to the law. Is a lawmaker who legislates for the common good responsible for his subjects' violation of the obligation that binds in conscience? Is the law, in our case the impediment, identified with their sin? "To be *more accurate*," the Bishop said. There is no accuracy in the statement at all. Again, we are told that *the grounds for dispensation are innumerable*. This is also false, as the Bishop might have learned had he looked up the instruction on matrimonial dispensations sent out by the Propaganda or the ordinary text-books of moral theology. *And the definitions of prenuptial impediments are countless!* If they are, then they are something like the good Bishop's errors in his article. For I assure him that these are very many. But the im-

pediments are also not countless, and they are all founded on the highest grounds of public welfare.

"The important question, it seems to me," remarks the author, "is not the ability of Rome to defend herself against merely verbal criticism, but the impossibility of defense against the immoralities resulting from the definitions of impediments." [Here again he falls into the same error already mentioned and the defense is not only impossible, but perfectly obvious.] "The declarations of nullity and the dispensations for marriage afterward, often only discovered and declared, and used as reasons and excuses for getting rid of an unhappy marriage and finding a way of entering upon another." Now let us see the practice of Rome. In the encyclical we have so often quoted Leo XIII. speaks thus: "Lastly, since we well know that none should be excluded from our charity, we commend, Venerable Brothers, to your fidelity and piety those unhappy persons who, carried away by the heat of passion and being utterly indifferent to their salvation, live wickedly together, without the bond of lawful wedlock. Let your utmost care be exercised in bringing back such persons to their duty; and both by your own efforts and by those of good men who will consent to help you, strive by every means that they may see how wrongly they have acted; that they may do penance and that they may be induced to enter into lawful marriage according to the Catholic rite." And Catholic priests all over the world follow this counsel of the Chief Pastor with such unwearied care and love that there are few points in the pastoral charge that cause more anxiety and unselfish devotion than this. Their whole intent and in the vast majority of cases the practical effect of their labors is that such unhappy unions are righted and God's blessing given the penitent pair. This is so true in actual practice that the case in which a declaration of nullity is given is rare, the ordinary remedy being revalidation, as the Bishop could have discovered by looking more closely into our text-books or by asking any experienced priest. [See Feije, "*De Dispensationibus Matrimonialibus*," n. 595. Gasparri, "*De Matrimonio*," n. 1,120 et seqq. Answer of the Congregation de Propaganda Fide, 13 Sept., 1760, and other answers.]

When the Sovereign Pontiff himself and the Sacred Congregations and our text-books and the daily experience of priests tell us what the practice is in this matter, may we not justly complain of a man who in writing an article on the theory and practice of Rome shows that he does not grasp the theory and utterly misrepresents the practice? When the chanceries of our dioceses are a living testimony to the revalidations of marriages, is it not pure calumny to say that "Rome justifies and practically sanctions what amounts to

divorce, although it is not called so in the freest possible manner unless both parties to the previous marriage are Roman Catholics?"

In extreme instances the nullity of the preceding union may be declared and subsequent marriage allowed. But first this is neither divorce nor the equivalent of divorce. Where two lawfully married persons are divorced and then after separation enter another marriage, their life is not conjugal at all; it is simple concubinage. When two invalidly married persons enter, after a declaration of nullity, another marriage, their second union alone is lawful wedlock. Again, such declarations of nullity are not and cannot be called divorce. Thirdly, such declarations are very rare in comparison with the vast numbers of lawful unions and of those unlawful ones that have been revalidated. Fourthly, such declarations are not made until it has been proved to evidence that the previous marriages were null and void, and that, too, against a specially appointed canonist whose business it is to defend the vinculum. No loop-hole is left in this matter for fraud, many petitions are rejected and the ones that are granted are comparatively very few indeed, as the Bishop might have seen had he looked into the "*Acta Sanctae Sedis*." How outrageous then it is for him to impugn our honesty by saying "that Rome justifies and practically sanctions what amounts to divorce, although it is not called so, *in the freest possible manner*." The strictest laws are laid down and, humanly speaking, deceit is almost impossible. Rome, then, in her practice and theory not only does not multiply the possibilities of remarriage, but actually minimizes and reduces them to the smallest number.

To sum up, the Bishop has misrepresented the Church of Rome in a way that is so offensive as to shock all who are acquainted with our real belief and practice, and to remind us of those that have eyes and see not, ears and hear not. He has stated as Catholic teaching what is not Catholic teaching. He has shown himself to be ignorant of Catholic practice. He tells us he has read Gury's work carefully and proves that he did not understand him.

It would be useless to follow him any farther. He has been refuted by anticipation in every text-book of Catholic theology. His insinuation against Rome's integrity in her practice is unworthy of his high position, is founded on ignorance of fact and will bear but little fruit in the hearts of honest men. Nay, more. He knows his statements are controvertible, for he tells us: "I am quite aware that this paper is open to criticism, to controversy and to contradiction." It is also open to the more serious charges of want of knowledge of the subject matter, of gross misrepresentation of Rome's theory and practice, and finally of extreme rashness, for what are we to think of an author who boldly states as truth in a

magazine of such high standing as the *North American Review* what he himself declares to be open to criticism, to controversy and to contradiction?

TIMOTHY BARRETT, S. J.

Woodstock, Md.

WHO ARE THE REAL THEOLOGIANS?

WHILE the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church was sitting in Boston last October Dr. Brophy, a professor of theology in the Brighton Seminary, took occasion to tell in the Boston *Herald* some of those truths that never can be told too often, even though the telling of them wound the feelings of Protestant Episcopalians very deeply. In a hot little pamphlet Father Van Allen, of the Church of the Advent, in Boston, rebukes not only Dr. Brophy, but also Dr. Brophy's chief, "the Bishop who boasts of being Peter's successor."

This pamphlet the *Churchman*, of New York, reviews admiringly. For the author it has only words of praise; for Dr. Brophy, only words of blame. It tells us that he is perverse and malevolent; that he appeals to an audience—we should prefer *readers*, but the mistake, except as an evidence of heat, is unimportant—invincibly ignorant; that he is a controversial Thersites, making grotesque assumptions and uttering vituperative assertions. We might dwell upon the rugged strength of this language, its lack of the fine culture characteristic of the members of the Protestant Episcopal Church, but so generally wanting in those of the Italian communion. We shall not do so. We are content to put the article aside with other elegant extracts against the inevitable hour when our Catholic writers shall be blamed once more for their shortcomings in the matter of "sweetness and light."

But in presenting Dr. Brophy to the world in his true colors, the *Churchman* brings up an old accusation against the Catholic Church at large. "It is worth while, from time to time," it says, "to call attention to the sacrifices, ethical and intellectual, that the Church of Rome demands from those who are attracted by the military perfection of her organization." That the organization of the Society of Jesus is military everybody knows who knows anything. It is governed by a general, whom, nearly thirty years ago, *Punch* drew according to popular credulity, in a cassock loosely thrown over a general's uniform complete to jack-boots, spurs and a huge sabre. But that the Church also in her organization is military is something new. Theology teaches that she is a society

complete and independent, capable therefore of making laws and of compelling obedience to them. It is this that produces in her, as in any well ordered human society, that perfect subordination of inferiors to superiors which is the envy of the Protestant Episcopal Church. This, too, calls itself a complete society, yet it does not find obedience or subjection within itself. But instead of recognizing in its sect an imperfection on this account, a lack of social unity, the *Churchman*, in the jaunty style so common among Episcopalians, denies by implication that such harmony of its members is an essential perfection of every complete society by making it a note of an organization exclusively military.

This unconscious misconception of the constitution of the Church, the effect of Episcopalian looseness of thought, introduces us to the subject of this article, the alleged intellectual inferiority of the Catholic clergy to those of the Protestant Episcopalian Church. This inferiority, which in its allusion to the intellectual sacrifices required by the Roman Church, the *Churchman* implies, others openly assert. Clergymen who have made their scanty studies, no one knows where, whose library consists of a few hand-books of controversy, take a lofty tone in speaking of those who have served, as did Jacob for Rachel, their seven years in the schools before entering upon their life as priests. They speak of them as unscholarly, no theologians, as if they themselves possessed the sum of all scholarship and had sounded every depth of theological science. What their scholarship and science really are can be shown by example.

Some few months ago a clergyman whose conscience had been violated by the action of the General Convention in sending missionary Bishops to Cuba and Mexico, wrote to the *Living Church* on the subject.¹ His letter was modest, well worded and to the point. The theologian and canonist of the *Living Church*, taking a high, magisterial tone well calculated to impress the writer of the letter and all who think with him, acknowledged that in sending Bishops to those republics the Protestant Episcopal Church had violated the letter of the eighth canon of the Council of Nicaea, and then proceeded to give reasons to justify the act.²

Before considering these reasons, we must remark that one who says: "The letter of the law is violated," insinuates the correlative: "The spirit of the law is kept." To show this, therefore, should have been the justification of the act. But this the theologian and canonist of the *Living Church* did not attempt. Perhaps he felt instinctively that to do so would be to run the risk of bringing

¹ *The Living Church*, Dec. 3, 1904.

² *Ibid.*

out clearly how incompatible with the ideas of the Fathers of Nicaea is the modern branch theory of Episcopalians. However this may be, in each of the six reasons he tries to show either that the action of the convention does not touch the canon, which, if this be the case, is not violated either in the spirit or the letter; or that circumstances compelled the ignoring of the canon, which in such a case may easily have been violated as well in the spirit as in the letter. Here, therefore, one may see another example of the loose but pretentious thinking by which the leaders of Anglicanism impose upon their simpler brethren.

It is necessary to premise, also, that as these reasons take for granted the branch theory of the Church, they cannot have even a *prima facie* value for Catholics. We shall therefore discuss them in part at least from a Protestant Episcopalian point of view.

The first reason brought is necessity. The Catholic Bishops and clergy in Mexico and Cuba will not give the sacraments to Protestant Episcopalians. This reason savors curiously of jesuitry. It is an unblushing application of the famous principle: "The end justifies the means;" and the *Churchman* may learn from it that ethical sacrifices have to be made by those that resist Roman seductions as well as by those that succumb to them. Moreover, is there no alternative? Do the Catholic Bishops and clergy refuse unconditionally to admit Protestant Episcopalians to the sacraments? There used to be a theory much in vogue that a true Catholic should conform himself to the legitimate branch of the Church in the region where he finds himself; that by frequenting the ministrations of Anglican chaplains south of the English Channel, no less than by attending on those of Roman priests north of it, one becomes guilty of the sin of schism. Could not the General Convention have recommended this theory to Protestant Episcopalians in Mexico and Cuba as a rule of conduct? The *Living Church* might ask: "Would you have them confess and communicate surreptitiously, as do the doctrinaire supporters of this theory when traveling in Europe?" By no means. We hold such conduct not merely dishonest, but even sacrilegious. Let them simply conform. "But," would reply the *Living Church*, "Roman Bishops and priests require as a condition of communion that Protestant Episcopalians should renounce their own branch of the Church Catholic." Well, they could hardly do otherwise. They scout the branch theory and look upon Protestant Episcopalians as heretics, with regard to whom the apostolic injunction is clear. Besides, the branch theory notwithstanding, Protestant Episcopalian Bishops and clergy will not receive Catholics to communion unless these renounce their own Church by denying its doctrines. "The General Convention could not recommend

Protestant Episcopalians to abjure their own religion," might continue the *Living Church*. "This would have been to stultify itself." We do not see how that can be helped. We simply remark that when a theory leads necessarily either to jesuitry, sacrilege or self-stultification, there must be, according to the laws of logic, something the matter with it.

The second reason depends for its validity upon the first. "The Latin-American nations," says the theologian and canonist of the *Living Church*, "are lapsing, or have partially lapsed, from the Catholic faith. If, therefore, the first justification gave us the right of entry into these lands, the second makes it our duty to do what we can to restore those who have fallen in the same lands, after we have entered them." If, therefore, on the contrary, the first justification is, as we have shown, powerless to give a right of entry, nothing is left for Protestant Episcopalians but to get out as quickly as possible of the lands they have entered under false pretences, no matter how much the condition of the inhabitants may appeal to them.

Moreover, the second reason includes a three-fold assumption: First, the lapse, at least partial, of the Latin-American nations; second, the inability of the Roman Church to restore them; third, the efficacy for such a work of Protestant Episcopalianism. We deny all three. The Latin-Americans are not lapsing from the Catholic faith. To each individual we may say almost as confidently as did St. Paul to King Agrippa, "I know that thou believest." With regard to Cuba and Mexico, the very clergyman whom the theologian and canonist of the *Living Church* would instruct, Rev. Burr M. Weeden, bears witness to the falseness of the charge. "There is disregard of religion," says he in his letter to the *Living Church*, "in Mexico and Cuba as in the United States. The Church there has forfeited in part her hold upon the people as she has here. I have traveled extensively in Cuba and Mexico, and I do not hesitate to say that Christian piety and the grace of Christian character are quite as common there as among us."

It is impossible for a Protestant to get at the inner life of a Latin-American family. Yet it is almost as impossible to persuade ordinary tourists of this. Their assumed superiority, which with Protestant English-speaking races has become the next thing to an article of faith, leads them to despise the Latin races in their hearts. When some individuals of these receive one politely and talk of things indifferent in complimentary tones, when in club or office men tainted with liberalism or adept in Freemasonry say the things they think will be most agreeable or take him to see what experience has taught them most gratifies the sensual appetites of

the English or American traveler, he fondly thinks that he has drawn them out, discovered the emptiness of their hearts, and applying the old rule, *ex uno disce omnes*, announces that the whole nation is falling away from the faith. He little dreams what contempt lurks beneath the polite exterior. Strong in his self-conceit, he cannot realize that he, in his turn, is despised as an English or Yankee heretic; that the religious thought of his hosts is as sedulously concealed from him as ever the faith was by early Christian from pagan Roman or Greek, and for much the same reason, uncomplimentary though Scriptural, "Give not that which is holy to dogs, neither cast thy pearls before swine, lest they turn again and rend you."

Mr. Weeden was a traveler of another class. Nevertheless, his opportunities of observing the religion of the Cubans and Mexicans was limited by the distrust these have of Americans, especially when the American is a Protestant minister. Hence his testimony is especially valuable because it comes from one who, from the nature of things, could see only what lay on the surface. We freely grant his assertion that there are in Latin-American countries those who disregard religion. There must be everywhere. But it is also true that the visitor to those countries is more likely to meet the irreligious than the religious. The Latin-American is irreligious because he has fallen under the influence of Freemasonry, which often controls the government entirely, always to a certain degree. Hence the men in public office are Masons, the men of business are infected with Masonry, and these are they whom the traveler usually comes in contact with in the great cities. They are hostile to the Catholic religion during their lives because they are the instruments of the world-wide anti-Christian society, which, persecuting the Catholic Church, looks upon every Protestant sect as an ally. But they are not therefore necessarily lapsing from their faith. When they are face to face with death, how many send for the priests and the sacraments they have warred against during life, those same priests can tell, but the Protestant tourist can never know.

The theologian and canonist of the *Living Church* assumes the inability of the Catholic Church to restore religion in Latin-American countries. In this he directly contradicts those who have the greatest interest in the matter and the best means of knowing its facts, the Bishops and clergy on the one hand, who labor confidently to preserve and increase religion, and their Masonic enemies on the other, who by legislation and brute force do all they can to cripple its activities. That they are far from the success the *Living Church* believes them to be on the point of achieving, is evident from their

constant striving after more efficacious legislation, a more rigorous application of force. If, instead of frequenting the company of only the enemies of the Church, tourists in Latin-American countries would go to the Bishops and heads of religious orders and ask for the number of those, men as well as women, who make their Easter, hear Mass, attend to the religious education of their children, belong to pious confraternities and call for the rites of the Church in their last hour, they would get statistics that would astonish them.

But, supposing the Catholic Church incapable of supporting the tottering faith of the Latin-Americans, it is not easy to see what the Protestant Episcopal Church can do in the matter. Mr. Weeden in the letter the theologian and canonist of the *Living Church* would answer testifies that "the infidel and immoral classes in Latin-America name themselves Protestants;" and it must be remembered that there no distinction is made between Protestant Episcopalians and other Protestant sects. Bishop Kinsolving seems to admit that in Brazil his flock, small as it is, consists principally of aliens and the excommunicated.³

Bishop Aves has not been long at work in his new field. All he can write is that his first service in the capital was followed with a great deal of interest by a congregation that filled the church to its utmost capacity.⁴

A Protestant Bishop conducting service in the City of Mexico must no doubt have been an object of interest, and it is natural that he should be enthusiastic at the opening of his career. Nevertheless, he would hardly wish us to look upon the interest manifested by his hearers as signs of a tendency towards the Protestant Episcopal Church in those of them who have lapsed from their Roman obedience. He has probably been spending his leisure hours in seeing the sights, and may have visited, with no little show of interest, the cathedral and other great churches of his new home. Should he have done so, the Archbishop would not therefore have been justified in looking upon him as a prospective convert, nor would the Bishop of Dallas be disturbed on that account with fears that he had forgotten the admonition of the consecration sermon not to swerve from his own steadfastness. The venerable Bishop may recall a spring day in 1860 when, a young man, he perhaps attended another Bishop newly come into his diocese on a visit to a gathering of Indian children. "We sang heartily," wrote the Bishop, "and when we finished we found a remarkable impression had been produced." Any one who ever had the privilege, not of

³ *Boston Transcript*, Oct. 19, 1904; *The Churchman*, Oct. 29, 1904.

⁴ *The Living Church*, Feb. 11, 1905.

hearing, but of seeing the first Bishop of Columbia sing a hymn, can well believe that this performance left the little Indians, to use his own words, "reverently hushed in a fixed and thoughtful manner." But the Songish Indians of Victoria, though impressed, remained unconverted; and we are persuaded that when Bishop Aves has been as long in Mexico as Bishop Kinsolving has been in Brazil the Mexicans also will still be unconverted and his congregation will be made up, as is that of the elder prelate, of aliens and excommunicated Freemasons.

After being in Havana a single week Bishop Knight writes that his hands are full, the work is enormous, the opportunity golden.⁵ It may seem strange that Bishop Van Buren, who used similar language regarding his work in Porto Rico, did not have the same experience in Cuba.⁶ But Bishop Knight explains that his arrival happened at the psychological moment when reforms instituted by the Church of Rome were turning out to be failure. Still he is careful to add that if the Protestant Episcopal Church is to take advantage of the golden opportunity it must prove to Cubans inclining towards the new gospel that it has come to stay. Therefore he asks sympathizers in the United States to build him a "noble" cathedral. "This will be the key to unlock the door to great success." It is a roseate dream, but it does not explain the "enormous work," unless indeed this be part of the dream, to disappear with the awakening. Like Bishop Kinsolving, he tells how the officials of the republic and the newspapers are on his side; from which we may conclude that his congregation, too, will be composed in greatest part of aliens and excommunicated Freemasons.

The third reason alleged on behalf of the sending of Protestant Episcopalian Bishops into Latin-American countries takes us to a higher plane. "We justify it," says the theologian and canonist of the *Living Church*, "on canonical grounds. Canons of discipline were never intended to bind so closely that they might never be reconsidered. Very many of them are allowed, for good reasons, to be dead letters." He quotes some examples of this from the same Council of Nicaea, that, according to him, decreed that there shall be but one Bishop in one city. Thus at certain times all must pray standing and not kneeling; deacons may not sit amongst priests; Bishops, priests and deacons may not pass from one city to another, but must remain in the place for which they were ordained.

Granting, for the moment, the principles laid down in the beginning of this reason, we must remark, with regard to their application, that the reconsideration of a law belongs to the legislative

⁵ *The Churchman*, Jan. 28, 1905.

⁶ *The Churchman*, Oct. 22, 1904.

authority that made it. No inferior authority can do anything in the matter. Hence the General Convention was incapable of reconsidering the law in question. Nothing less than a general council could do so, and this no general council has ever done. Again, for a law to become justly a dead letter it is necessary that there be a general consent regarding its inapplicability in existing circumstances, its actual non-observance and the tacit consent of the supreme authority. It is evident that these conditions are not verified with regard to the prohibition of conflicting jurisdictions, and therefore that it has not become a dead letter.

But is it true that *all* canons of discipline can be reconsidered or become dead letters? In the alleged justification canons of discipline are evidently opposed to dogmatic canons; and it is assumed that, though these are irreformable, those are subject to change. This assumption ignores the distinction between things forbidden because evil in themselves and things indifferent in themselves that become evil because forbidden. As for the canons quoted as having become dead letters, it is not at all sure that such is absolutely the case. But it is clear that the matter of the first, namely, the position in prayer, belongs to the category of indifferent things that may become evil when forbidden, but which may again become indifferent when the prohibition is no longer enforced. The matter of the second and third, namely, the place of the deacons in the church and the passing of Bishops and priests from the city for which they were ordained to others, considered in itself, is also indifferent. Hence such canons as these may be reconsidered or become dead letters.

But when the matter of the canon is forbidden because it is evil of its own nature, there can be no question of its being reconsidered or becoming a dead letter. Thus, for instance, when we find prohibited in canon iii. of this same Council of Nicaea, the dwelling in priests' houses of women other than those above all suspicion, we never dream that the prohibition, because it is disciplinary, can be abrogated. Another striking example of things forbidden because wrong in themselves, is to be seen in the very canon xviii. which the *Living Church* brought forward as one that has become obsolete. It was cited by the theologian and canonist of that newspaper as merely forbidding to deacons the apparently harmless practice of sitting among the priests in church. As a matter of fact, its scope was to regulate serious abuses of which deacons were guilty in certain places during the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. It forbade them to administer the Holy Eucharist to priests; it reprobated their practice of taking communion themselves before the celebrating Bishop had received, and finished by telling them to keep their

own place and not even to sit among the priests. As all can see, the things forbidden by this canon differ amongst themselves in their nature, and he would be reckless indeed who would dare to assert, not that it is obsolete, but even that it ever can become so.

Now the maintainers of the branch theory have always agreed with Catholics that the matter of the prohibition of two episcopal jurisdictions in the same place comes under the category of things forbidden because they are evil. If, therefore, the *Living Church* would convince them that they are wrong, that the prohibition may be retracted or become obsolete, it will have to prove that the co-existence of two conflicting jurisdictions is a matter indifferent in itself. As its theologian and canonist does not seem to have access to the canons of the Council of Nicaea in their entirety, we shall give him what help we can in his task by informing him that canon viii. does not forbid, formally, the co-existence of conflicting episcopal jurisdictions. Its scope is to prescribe what is to be done with Novatians coming to the Church; and when it treats of the conduct to be held towards the reconciled Bishops, it uses for the foundation of its legislation the inadmissibility of co-existing episcopal jurisdictions as a first principle that all acknowledge. How a first principle can become obsolete is not very clear.

The fourth reason is that Roman Bishops in Latin-American countries are not diocesans in the Nicene sense, but simply vicars of the Bishops of Rome, exercising only a delegated jurisdiction in those lands. Even if this were true, it must be remembered that the branch theory does not suppose for a moment the Roman, the Greek or the Anglican branch to be up to the Nicene standard. On the contrary, it takes for granted that each has its own shortcomings due to our unhappy divisions, which as they can be cured by no human effort, must be endured with patience until God in His good time shall bring back the unity of Nicene times. The cardinal point of the whole theory, therefore, is that we must accept the branch churches as they are. None may dwell upon the deficiencies of his own so as to stir up a spirit of dissatisfaction; and with equal reason none may pry into the deficiencies of another. Anglicans must bear patiently with heretical Bishops and clergymen; Orientals must be content to have them fossilized, ignorant and dependent upon a civil power infidel in great part; Latin-Americans, to have them as degraded as the missionary reports make them out to be. All this is but a trial of the individual's faith. Hence it ill becomes a theologian and canonist of the Anglican branch to pass judgment on the way that Bishops are appointed in the Roman branch.

From the supposed fact that the Roman Bishops in Latin-American countries have only delegated jurisdiction from the Bishop

of Rome, the *Living Church* concludes that they are without any legitimate jurisdiction whatever. The process is very simple. The Bishop of Rome has no jurisdiction over those regions, therefore he cannot delegate any to his vicars. If such be the case of Roman Bishops, that of Protestant Episcopalian Bishops is, if possible, worse. What jurisdiction they possess they derive from the General Convention, which according to popular opinion in Latin-America at least, has much less authority to send its Bishops thither than the Pope has to appoint his own. Moreover, they are not accepted by Latin-Americans as are the Roman Bishops. It would seem, therefore, that according to the canonist and theologian of the *Living Church*, jurisdiction may be duplicated in Latin-American lands because as yet there are no lawful jurisdictions there. If this be so, they may be triplicated and quadruplicated ad infinitum.

The *Living Church* admits that the Roman Bishops in Latin-America have *de facto* jurisdiction, which means in plain language that they are usurpers. Admitting this, one is forced to the strange conclusion that they are usurpers of an authority which never had a legitimate possessor; for from the introduction of Christianity into Latin-America, only Roman Bishops have governed its churches; that they are usurpers of an authority of which no legitimate claimant exists, of which there is not the remotest prospect of a legitimate claimant appearing. Whether there can be in the Church, as in civil society, a usurper possessing authority *de facto* but not *de jure* is perhaps doubtful. If, however, it be admitted, it is because the principles whence the possibility is derived for civil society are held to be applicable to the Church also. But if this be so, there is no reason why the consequences of these principles should not be pushed as regards the Church to their last conclusions to prove that in it, as in civil society, a usurper may become a legitimate ruler; and so the Roman Bishops fulfilling all the conditions required, could be shown to be lawful diocesans possessing jurisdiction *de jure*.

But for the *Living Church* they are always usurpers. Yet it admits that if they would but minister to Protestant Episcopalians they could lawfully keep the missionary Bishops of the General Convention out of Latin-America. Hence, these also are admitted to be usurpers; a hard blow for Bishop Aves, who preached his first sermon in the City of Mexico from the text: "He that receiveth me, receiveth him that sent me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me;"¹ a hard blow for the Bishop of Dallas, his consecrator. who chose for the text of the consecration sermon: "Take heed unto yourselves and to all the flock over which the Holy

¹ *The Living Church*, Feb. 11, 1905.

Ghost hath made you overseers. . . . Go, teach all nations. . . . Lo, I am with you alway;"⁸ and for the Bishop of Louisiana, who at Bishop Knight's consecration preached from the words: "Sir, we would see Jesus."⁹

But is it true, even from an Anglican point of view, that Roman Bishops in Latin-American countries are not diocesans in the Nicene sense? To begin with, the theologian and canonist of the *Living Church* mistakes egregiously when he says that they are but vicars of the Bishop of Rome with only delegated jurisdiction. The Catholic Church distinguishes very sharply between vicars-apostolic and diocesans. Theologians dispute as to whether the Sovereign Pontiff is for these a medium through which they receive jurisdiction from Christ, or whether this is conferred by Christ directly upon the one whom the appointment or approbation or consent of the Holy See has designated publicly as the one chosen to rule a certain portion of the flock. The latter opinion is held by many, including the famous Jesuit, Vasquez. The former is the more common, but no accepted opinion teaches that the diocesans of any country are only vicars of the Bishop of Rome.

Now Anglicans agree with Catholics that jurisdiction comes to a Bishop from Christ through some concrete fact. The origin of jurisdiction is unchangeable; the fact by which are designated the Bishop and the diocese he is to rule may change. According to Anglican ideas this may be nomination by an apostle, election by the Bishops of the province, by a chapter, by the General Convention, popular election, royal nomination, the peculiar process followed in this country when the General Convention is not in session. Why then may it not sometimes be Papal appointment? The national character of churches is an important point in the branch theory. In Latin-American countries the Roman Church is the legitimate national church. If the national church chooses that Papal appointment shall be for it the concrete fact to determine the person in whom episcopal jurisdiction is to reside and the diocese over which he is to exercise it, we do not see how Protestant Episcopalians can consistently refuse to admit that Bishops so determined are diocesans in the Nicene sense.

The fifth reason is a strange one. Rightly or wrongly, it says, some have undertaken the work. This being the case, it is better that the whole Church should direct it with superior wisdom than that it should be left to the limited prudence of a mere section of the Church. Utility, apart from morality, is here brought out strongly. Whether the work be right or wrong, we are compelled

⁸ *The Churchman*, Dec. 31, 1904.

⁹ *The Living Church*, Dec. 31, 1904.

to take it up. One is tempted to ask: "Would it not be better to examine into the right or wrong of the matter, and if it prove to be wrong, to stop it?" But he remembers that Anglicanism has not the military organization of the Church of Rome. The reason reminds us of the sentiment attributed, we believe, to Commodore Bainbridge: "My country! May she always be right! But, right or wrong, my country!" Such lack of principle in a sailor is treated with some indulgence. In a theologian and canonist it calls for reprehension.

The sixth and last reason amounts to this. The Church has resolved to support these missions. She is responsible; you are not. Pay your assessment for missions. Only five per cent. of your contribution will go to such as trouble your conscience; ninety-five per cent. to those of which you approve. Perhaps the theologian and canonist of the *Living Church* had in his mind what Mr. Mantalini said of the half-penny, and thought concerning the five per cent. what the dignity of his position forbade him to utter. However this may have been, he offers his correspondent this choice bit of commercialism to save his conscience, and leaves him puzzled perhaps by the show of learning the six reasons contain; but, if we mistake not, as unsettled as ever in his soul.

HENRY WOODS, S. J.

San Francisco, Cal.

THE INSIDE OF THE AGLIPAYAN CHURCH.

VERY few, even among those resident in the Philippines, understand the real import and tendencies of the "Philippine Independent Church," which was founded by Gregorio Aglipay, one of the native priests, a couple of years ago, and has been keeping the Filipinos ever since in a chronic state of turmoil and unrest. It has been written up in newspapers and periodicals as a laudable and natural revolt against the spiritual tyranny of Rome, such as produced Protestantism in the sixteenth century. According to this view, the Filipinos, under the protection of the American Government, are now shaking off the yoke of Rome as their minds are opening to the light of the Gospel. This ready and plausible theory, industriously circulated by Aglipay and his companions, has had the effect of throwing dust in the eyes of the American people and blinding them to the true inwardness of the situation. The truth is, the movement is not religious, but political. Under the guise of religious zeal, it conceals the elements of revolution; patriotism, as understood by the Filipinos, and not religion, is the

hidden spring that is producing its febrile activity and its peculiarly violent and aggressive character. It is simply a phase of the revolt of the yellow against the white man, one of those self-assertive movements of the Asiatic races within recent years which, rightly directed, has led to the development of Japan and, wrongly directed, to the excesses of the Boxer movement in China and the formation of the bloody Katipunan society in the Philippines in the early nineties. Owing to its essentially political character, Aglipayism has been able to combine elements the most incompatible, judged from a religious standpoint, and has induced believers and unbelievers to work in unison for an end which appears religious to the uninitiated only. The amity of Protestant bodies also has been sought for and obtained, but it counts for nothing and is held of little account except as a blind. What, however, is truly remarkable is that the movement has the active support of professed atheists and free-thinkers, of revolutionists who never enter a church or think about religion, of men high in the grades of Latin Freemasonry, who are pledged to extirpate Christianity, all of whom are utilizing the revolt of Aglipay for a common end.

The immediate cause of the schism was not doctrinal differences, for Aglipay broke away from Rome while still believing all she taught; it was disappointed ambition. If the Pope had thought fit to raise Aglipay and other native priests to the episcopal sees and place entirely in native hands the spiritual guidance and temporal emoluments of the parishes, the schism would never have taken place. But this was not to be, and could not be—hence the revolt. In spite of the well-known desire of the Catholic Church to foster a native priesthood in all countries, it seems a long way off before the desire can be fully accomplished. If we look around among the colored races to whom Christianity has been preached for the last three or four hundred years, we find that up to the present time the great work of propagating and preserving the faith is done by missionaries from Europe, and that the native priests are few and far between. This is not owing to absence of facilities for entering the ranks of the priesthood, but to lack of true vocations. A bishop of a diocese in Mexico has complained lately that for the last sixteen years his seminary has been able to produce only one priest, though it has been in good working order, and for the last five years has been in the charge of four zealous Vincentian fathers, a congregation that has the care of the education of priests in several parts of Europe.

In the Philippines, too, every facility was given to the natives, during the three centuries and a half of Spanish occupation, to enter the priesthood. Seminaries were built specially for their use, and the university in Manila was freely open to them. But though

the ordained natives were generally some hundreds in number, many occupying important parishes, they never showed that they were capable of distinguished positions, and the great bulk of them had of necessity to be under the immediate direction of the Spanish friars. Though they were better off, as regards numbers and positions, than the native clergy in most other tropical regions, they posed as an oppressed body of men. But if that plea had any foundation in the Philippines, it would hold with much greater force against the European missionaries in other countries. Profoundly dissatisfied with their position, though showing no outward sign of it by their demeanor, they took a leading part in organizing the revolt at Cavite in 1872, for complicity in which three of them, Gomez, Burgos and Zamora, now regarded by the Aglipayans as martyrs, were executed and some others banished to the Marian Islands. Several of them, later on, including students in the seminaries, joined the Katipunan society and were privy to its murderous programme. Three of them had to be executed for complicity in the Tagalo rebellion of 1896. Two years later, on the coming of the Americans, the great majority ranged themselves on the side of the revolutionists, and such was their warlike spirit that they threw off the soutane and dressed in military costumes. In Vigan the grotesque spectacle was afforded every evening of the students of the seminary going for their usual constitutional round the town dressed as soldiers, with their director following them done up as an officer. Needless to say that their deeds during their war with the Americans are still a topic of conversation. Sometimes openly and sometimes in secret they took an active part in the war, and many are the accusations of foul play alleged against them.

It is well to take these facts into consideration to form an opinion of the character and real aspirations of the ecclesiastical leaders of the Aglipay movement. It is not religion that troubles them, but patriotism, as they understand it. At heart they are all fanatically opposed to the white man, be he Spanish or American. Aglipay voices the feelings of his party when he declares that he will never rest satisfied till all the friars and the Jesuits and the nuns are banished from the islands, and he adds that they do not want priests of any other nationality, American or Frenchman or Italians. The watchword is "the Philippines for the Filipinos," a phrase which Isabelo de los Reyes, who claims to be the real founder of the Aglipayan Church, explains to his own satisfaction when he says in his "Religion Katipunan" that the Philippines will never be a perfect country till all the government, civil, military and ecclesiastical, is in the hands of the Filipinos.

The banishment of the Spanish friars and the confiscation of their property was long mooted in the Philippines by the Spanish anti-clericals, both through motives of hatred to religion and because they hoped for some personal gain at the division of the spoils. The cry was taken up from them by the Filipino revolutionary party, most of the members of which had passed some years in Spain. It was early understood by the latter that this would be the first step towards independence. This irreligious campaign had the sympathy of the great majority of the native clergy, who, if it were successful, would enter into possession of all the parishes in the archipelago. Since the revolution they have gained their point; all the parishes, with some insignificant exceptions, have been under their charge for the last six years, and the deplorable results of the change can be testified to by all residents in the Philippines.

What, however, is apparently inexplicable is that although the friars have been scattering during the past few years, till less than a fourth of their number remains, most of whom are cooped up in Manila, the cry against them has grown more furious as time has gone on. Not a day passes in which they are not attacked by the vile Filipino press. Aglipay exhausts his vocabulary of vituperative terms against them whenever he speaks in public. The ready explanation that will come to the minds of most Americans is the memory of past tyranny and oppression. Nothing is further from the truth. I have argued with Aglipayans on this crucial question, and although at first they would blurt out the usual grievances of the friars keeping them in ignorance for three hundred years and denouncing them to the Spanish authorities, they changed their tone so rapidly on being asked for proofs that it was plain that their first statements were mere catch-cries in the mouths of a profoundly ungrateful people. The world has never seen such a huge display of ingratitude as that shown by the anti-friar party in the Philippines, for they owe everything they have to the friars. It is often said that if you do a Filipino a favor you make an enemy of him. This has certainly been the experience of the friars, for Rizal and some other prominent anti-friar writers received great benefits from the orders they wrote against. Aglipay would never have been able to become a priest only for the Dominicans. He was brought as a child to Manila by his uncle, who was concierge at the Dominican convent, and was kept gratis at the Dominican College of St. John Lateran's. As his parents were extremely poor and not able to supply him with books and clothes, these also were given to him by the fathers. What memory of oppression can this man have? What impels him to go about reviling his benefactors? He seems to have friars on the brain, his rabies being especially apparent

in his violent pamphlet, "Frailocracia," from which it would appear that the whole Church is ruled by friars, including the Pope, whose commands they set at defiance.

These shameful and spiteful exhibitions are the outcome of ungovernable passion; reason has very little to do with them. Those who talk wildly about the Spanish friars are people who are raging because the Americans took possession of the country just as they thought they had independence within their grasp; and having to adopt a hypocritical and servile tone to their conquerors, owing to the strict censorship of the press, they vent their bile on the Spanish friars, as a bad-humored man will ill-treat his horse when in a temper. It also gratifies the inordinate vanity of the Filipino to be able to rail at the white man, and raises him in his own estimation, while it gratifies his cowardly cruelty to jump on a fallen enemy or one whom he is pleased to consider as such. All this, besides, serves an ulterior purpose; it is like the noisy demonstration in force, made in front of an enemy to distract his attention while a real attack is being prepared on his flank.

Of Aglipayism, as a church with a distinct religious teaching, it is premature to speak. Aglipay himself can give no rational account of his schism, or separation from Rome, other than a tirade of abuse against the friars. Not many who know him will give him credit for religious sincerity. As long as he was in hopes of becoming a Bishop he was a most obedient adherent of the Holy See, quoting Papal bulls and canon law and Catholic theologians in his circular letters to the clergy. Then came his excommunication from the Archbishop of Manila for his usurpation of the ecclesiastical authority. For he had made himself vicar general of the revolutionary army, and had been ordering the priests not to pay attention to the commands of the Spanish bishops. It was after his surrender to the American troops that he resolved, now that his hopes of preferment were blasted, to set up a little popedom for himself. A long conference with Aguinaldo and another with some of the disaffected clergy resulted in his calling himself the "Obispo Maximo," equivalent to the title of Supreme Pontiff, and going through the form of consecrating three times as many bishops as there were episcopal sees in the archipelago. A more intellectual man would try to justify by careful reasoning such an extraordinary transformation. Tirades and abuse and bold assertions are not reasoning, but they seem to be sufficient for him. The Pope is a millionaire; the friars are powerful and tyrannical; the Church of Rome is the church of the friars; the meek and humble little church of the Philippines has arisen, and God has given it His blessing, and so it has grown big and strong; it is under the protection of

Our Lady of Dolores and St. Joseph, etc., with plenty more of this rhodomontade may be read in the pamphlet "Frailocracia." How far removed from the way of the meek and humble are the Aglipayans we shall see later on.

In matters of faith the new church has rapidly developed symptoms of heresy. In the catechism published this year in its bi-weekly organ, *La Iglesia Filipina Independiente*, the fundamental Christian dogma of the Blessed Trinity, Three Persons in One God, is spoken of as an absurdity. The real absurdity is that the Aglipayans, while denying fundamental doctrines and rejecting the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, keep up all the Roman ritual, cultivate modern devotions, practice the cult of the saints and carry their statues in procession, pray for the dead and offer up the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. Their actions do not accord with their speech. They denounce in public what they themselves publicly practice. I heard one of their young ministers in a set speech denouncing the friars for "preaching false miracles of saints and telling the people that they could get souls out of Purgatory for money," a usual way of speaking against devotion to the saints and Masses for the dead, and nevertheless, impelled by custom, they follow religious practices which come under these denunciations.

The Aglipayans at present, clergy and laity, do not know what to believe, and are drifting they know not whither. There is a rationalist element at work in their body, headed by Isabelo de los Reyes, who calls himself the founder of the church, is the director of its official organ and the president of the council of laymen. Isabelo was closely connected with the revolution, and was imprisoned in a Spanish fortress for sedition. A few years ago he published a little book, "*Le Religion Katipunan*," embodying the result of his studies on the religion of the Filipinos in pre-Spanish times; and in it he boldly advises the Filipinos to return to their ancient religious ideas. He finds that all religions, Christianity, Mohammedanism and Buddhism, are good, and all are at bottom true. The worship of Bathala, as practiced of yore by the Filipinos, is the same as the worship of God practiced by Christians—just the same thing under different names. It is hard to know exactly what Isabelo aims at in his book, whether a resuscitation of paganism or a form of deism or pantheism, but the tendency of the work is decidedly anti-Christian. It shows the bent of his mind to have added to the book the rules and constitution of the bloodthirsty Katipunan society that was responsible for so many cruelties practiced on Spaniards and Americans. According to Isabelo, all religions being at heart the same and all equally true, and variety of worship being more pleasing to God than sameness, the new Philippine Church justifies its exist-

ence by being distinct from all others and national. It is founded on the Bible, but being a civilized church and the daughter of the twentieth century, it makes use of the latest researches of modern science to interpret the Bible. Isabelo is able to whittle down Christian doctrine as he will, and if he has his way there will soon be very little left for the Filipinos to believe in. He denies the existence of hell and the demon. Aglipay's secretary, writing on this point to the official organ, calls these denials "enormes barbaridades" against the Holy Scriptures, and yet naïvely observes that Isabelo in his denials is only using the natural rights accorded to him by the Aglipayan Church. For the instruction of the Filipinos, Isabelo has also given them the life of Jesus Christ according to Renan. Modern rationalists are always quoted with approval, but Catholic theologians and the fathers of the Church never. "How could we go back," he says, "to St. Thomas and the Middle Ages, living as we are in an age which has produced Edison, Tolstoi and Flammarion?" though it is hard for ordinary mortals to see what these have to say to theology.

What is the principle of cohesion that binds together men of such opposite points of view—Aglipay, with his devotions, crucifixes and images, and Isabelo, with his scarcely veiled neopaganism, his rationalism and higher criticism? It is the mutual understanding that, under the semblance of religious zeal, both may work together for the emancipation of their race from the yoke of the white man, though on the part of Aglipay and other believers the process adopted means the entire sacrifice of religion on the altar of patriotism. The identical tendency of their minds, one starting from Christian and the other from non-Christian premises, may be perceived in the two pamphlets already referred to. In Aglipay's work, the last chapter, "La Patria," sounds the note of independence in no uncertain key. It is "unpatriotic" not to belong to the "Iglesia Filipina Independiente." He argues that for the country to be perfect it should be distinguished in manners, customs, language and religion from every other country, especially in religion, for that is what distinguishes one country "formally" from another. The very name of Isabelo's pamphlet, "La Religion Katipunan," should be enough to mark its political tendency. The religion of the Katipunan Society, if judged by the fiendish acts of cruelty sanctioned by it during the revolution, is simply a form of Oriental fanaticism, justifying in its ardent pursuit of an earthly and purely political object murder, assassination and robbery.

This secret revolutionary society is in full vigor at the present moment, and a state of things exists in the Philippines which is not unlike what preceded the revolution in Spanish times. Up to lately,

and probably even still, the rents have been collected regularly from the tenants of the friars' estates by agents of the society, ostensibly for revolutionary purposes. Even in such unlikely places as the camps on the great Benguet road, now in course of construction, a member of the society can terrorize other Filipinos into giving him money, as I have been informed by American overseers. From the reports sent in by the constabulary, it transpires that there are numbers of insurrectionary bands and societies, known by the names of "Guardia de Honor," "Dios-Dios" and other appellations, scattered through the country; these being all under a higher organization having its headquarters at Manila, whence all their raids are directed, the orders being transmitted by messengers by word of mouth to escape detection. In a recent rebellious attempt, in the province of Isabela, it also came out in the course of the trial that all the direction of the campaign had been received from Manila. Being in the same boat as the prisoners on their way to Manila, I had an opportunity of chatting with them. I thought it significant that the leaders had been members of the Katipunan Society in Spanish times. From an American lieutenant of Filipino scouts, who was returning from the woods and mountains of La Laguna, where he had been fighting for a month against the so-called *ladrones*, or robbers, I learned that constant meetings were taking place in every pueblo, furthering the work of a revolutionary society that was spread all over the country. He scouted the idea that the men in arms were ordinary *ladrones*, and said that they stole nothing at present because they were well supplied with money and ammunition from Manila and Hong Kong. It is known to the authorities that arms have been constantly smuggled into the country, and yet they cannot prevent it.

Mr. Taft and others in authority have placed great reliance on the loyalty of the Federal party, which is mainly composed of the old revolutionary leaders. This is not a party in the sense that there is another party in opposition to it. It is an organization so strong and universal that it excludes all others, and has all the political and civil appointments of Filipinos throughout the archipelago in its hands. There is not a provincial governor and hardly a president of a town who is not a member of the party. It is supposed that there is freedom of election in the Philippines, but in practice this freedom is a misnomer, for men are elected who are in opposition to the great body of the people. The Federal party is exercising a despotism that it would be well to inquire into. Having such power in its hands, we might suppose that the party would be open and above board in everything. On the contrary, it has its secret side, and sends private orders round by word of mouth to members in the

provinces, a practice which does not argue much loyalty to the American Government or regard for American institutions. Whatever may be said for the loyalty of those members who are occupying good positions and drawing large salaries, the great majority are revolutionists at heart, and would rise to-morrow if they thought they had a chance of success. The Federal party is but a poor reed to lean upon in face of the revolutionary Katipunan that embraces all classes.

Those who are well acquainted with the workings of Aglipay's church, such as constabulary officers, secret service men and other officials, several of whom I became acquainted with in my travels round the islands, do not put much faith in the loyalty of its leaders. They look upon it as a revolutionary organization, parading under the guise of religion. The introduction of Aglipayism into a parish is often the signal for disturbances, caused by a few influential men, who have never shown any signs of religion, getting up a faction in its favor and terrorizing the majority of the people. Moreover, most of the places where Aglipayism has been planted are known to the constabulary as centres of sedition. Several of the towns and villages of Pangasinan, Cavite, Cebu and Ilo-Ilo could be cited as instances. I was at an election meeting in one of the southern islands of a prominent Aglipayan candidate for the post of provincial governor, being the only white man present. A carefully prepared speech, read from the manuscript in Spanish, whilst openly anti-friar, was also covertly anti-American, and received great applause. I could not help noticing that although there was a profusion of bunting, the red and blue Katipunan colors being everywhere around, the American flag was conspicuous by its absence.

It is curious to note the number of Tagalos among the young boys who, after a six months' course in the Aglipayan seminary, are sent out to the Visayas and other islands to take charge of parishes. To me they seemed to have nothing to distinguish them from the Tagalo agents who spread the Katipunan in 1896, except that they wear a soutane.

Politics alone will explain the violent zeal for Aglipayism of men who have always been indifferent to religion. In one of the southern provinces, where there are hardly any Aglipayans to be found, except the provincial governor and the doctor, the former forced the people of a small town against their will to receive an Aglipayan priest, displaying his loaded revolver as he escorted the priest to the church. It is worthy of note that this governor had been the principal insurgent leader in that part of the country. He is known to have gotten rich by the money given to him to pay off his troops with, and his immoralities are so numerous and flagrant,

even for the Philippines, that they have drawn a private inquiry from the government.

As a specimen of violent opposition to the Catholic Church take the following: Some months ago the people of Dumanjug, a town of Cebu, were assembled to hold a procession as a thanksgiving to God for the disappearance of the cholera from the parish. The parish is very large, containing 22,000 Catholics, while just a few people are supposed to have Aglipayan sympathies, almost the only open Aglipayan being a man who was president at the time. Just as the procession was about to start on its way round the grounds of the church the president drove up in his carriage, displaying his revolver and accompanied by the municipal police, and forbade it to take place. No remonstrance was of any avail. It is curious how in the Philippines one influential man can tyrannize over thousands. This man stood practically alone in his opposition, for even the police acknowledged to the priest afterwards that they came against their will. Fortunately, the priest telephoned immediately for protection to the constabulary post at Barili, a town a few miles off, and an American officer with eight constables were sent to Dumanjug, and arrived to protect the procession in the afternoon. The indignation in Barili was so great that the volunteer police and many of the principal inhabitants came along with the constables. When they arrived they found that the president was still determined to put down the procession. He had gone into the church accompanied by a man on horseback, who was shouting out insults to the people assembled there. The officer put them both out, and as the fellow on horseback was contumacious, he had to throw him off on the ground to silence him. Then the procession took place without further disturbance. The president on another occasion, seized on all the musical instruments of the band belonging to the church, alleging that they belonged of right to the municipality. On an action being brought against him by the priest, he was obliged to restore the instruments and pay costs and damages. I got these facts from the priest at Dumanjug when I visited the town, and they were repeated to me on another occasion by the American officer.

The Aglipayan president of an important town in the province of La Laguna has been in the habit of utilizing the police for services they were never intended to perform. On the birth of a child a policeman is sent to notify the parents that they must get it baptized by the Aglipayan and not by the Catholic priest; on a death taking place, the family is told that they must get it buried by the Aglipayan. The police are also employed to work up the attendance of the Aglipayan Church. On last Holy Thursday the president sent them round to all the families who had statues that were usually

carried around the town in the Good Friday procession. These now got orders to send the statues to the Aglipayan procession, and it was intimated that if they sent them to the other they would be fined. By this means the Aglipayans managed to get up an imposing show, though it was noted that many who had been forced into it went to the Catholic Church in the evening. In his determined zeal for the new church, the president also wanted to fine parents for sending their children to the priest for catechetical instruction, and asked permission of the governor of the province to do so.

In the town of Cebu about six months ago the Aglipayans determined to hold an opposition procession at the very time the Catholics were holding theirs, in order to raise a conflict in the streets, but were obliged by the authorities to postpone it for some hours. The two processions presented a great contrast. The Catholic one showed the usual array of women, who in the Philippines have formed the bulk of every religious procession. The Aglipayan demonstration, on the other hand, consisted principally of some hundreds of men, among them being bodies of volunteer police carrying their lances, sent in by Aglipayan presidents of neighboring pueblos. This spectacle gave the procession more of a military than a religious appearance, and was significant of underlying motives.

In the town of Ilo-Ilo, after the Aglipayan church was built, the police were directed to do all they could to prevent the people belonging to that part of the town where it was situated attending Mass in the Catholic church. Men were stationed for this purpose at the end of a street through which it was necessary to pass to get to the Catholic church, and they exercised such intimidation that out of numbers who used to come only a few women remained who were bold enough to disregard municipal displeasure. I myself have seen a policeman in this very spot on a Sunday morning with his baton in his hand looking menacingly at every one who seemed to be going to Mass.

The audacity displayed by the Aglipayan presidents in the persecution of Catholics, who form in many instances the entire body of the population, can only be explained on the theory that they are known by the natives to belong to a strong political organization, which has its ramifications everywhere and possesses the power of terrorizing. They are all, of course, members of the Federal party. In addition, it is not too much to surmise that the real foundation of their strength lies in the fact that they belong to the Katipunan, now as vigorous as ever, though working in secret. As ordinary isolated individuals, even though in the enjoyment of presidential powers, they could never act as despotically as they are now doing with impunity.

The employment of atheists and pantheist free-thinkers to fill important posts in the Aglipayan Church must serve to discredit it as a real religious movement, even more than the untoward zeal of political firebrands. The editor of the Aglipayan organ *La Verdad*, is an atheist. The treasurer of the Aglipayan church in Cebu is a free-thinker. He gets all the receipts, rents a house for the priests and supplies them with food and raiment. How much of the money received is used for church work and how much for political purposes is not stated to the public. The man who was treasurer last year at Dagupan is also a noted free-thinker. He made himself very prominent in getting up disturbances on the return of the Dominican friars to take possession of their college. On that occasion he got into an argument with an American Protestant who spoke to him about his disgraceful conduct. "Do you believe in God?" said the American, thinking this argument unanswerable. "I believe in space," was the cynical reply.

In connection with Dagupan it will not be out of place to relate a peculiar incident that gives an insight into the extraordinary practices of the Aglipayans, the outcome of ignorance. A young Irish American Catholic came to confession and communion one day last year in the church in Manaoag, where I happened to be staying. He was also asking advice about marrying a certain native girl, and promised to come again and see about the matter. A few weeks afterwards, as I was driving into Dagupan, an American stopped me and asked if I knew So-and-so, naming the young man. On my replying in the affirmative, he informed me that the Aglipayans had baptized him the day before, and pointed out to me an old man who had acted as sponser. It appears that the young man, who was of weak intellect and not fully responsible for his actions, thinking that he would get to the marriage quicker by going to the native priests, had applied to them to sanctify the union, and they, in order to make, as they thought, a good beginning, had gone through the sacrilegious farce of re-baptizing him.

Incidentally, the Aglipayans are able to make a good deal of money out of the baptisms of Chinese. The Spanish friars had always had difficulties about baptizing the Chinese in the Philippines, having a long experience of their insincerity, and used to put them through a long probation. The Chinese there often desired to become Christians either with a direct view to marriage or because they imagined that the change in religion would help them in their business. These cases are now taken up readily by the Aglipayans, who, for a consideration of one or two hundred dollars, will baptize them without any preparation or instruction. But this disregard for the sanctity of baptism need not surprise us; Agli-

payanism all along has disregarded the essentials of all the Christian sacraments while professing to believe in them. How could a priest consecrate himself a Bishop, or a priest, parading as a Bishop, ordain priests? How could boys, having no real orders, say Mass and hear confessions? They say that they are not Protestants, nor rationalists, nor Romanists. They are, indeed, a little of all, combined in such heterogeneous fashion that they do not understand their own minds. As a political force Aglipayism has strength and unity; as a religion it is a mass of contradictions. It may go on for a time in its blundering way, but eventually the more intellectual of its members will drift into atheism, and the bulk of those whom it gains among the common people will fall back into the superstitious practices of heathenism from which they were weaned by the Spanish friars.

At the present time they think themselves above taking their religion from the white man. Their vanity gives them the air of independence and superiority. When the cry was got up against the Spanish bishops these, thinking it was on account of their being Spaniards that the tumult was raised by the anti-clerical party, resigned their sees that the Pope might give them to others. It was thought that the American bishops would smooth all difficulties. But these are also badly treated, and are constantly being insulted and reviled in the Aglipayan organs. The *Democracia* described them as "dogs of the same kind with different collars." Bishop Dougherty, of Vigan, was stoned by an Aglipayan crowd, and Bishop Rooker's life has been twice attempted, being on one occasion shot at, and at another time, while crossing a swollen river on a raft, the rope was maliciously cut and the raft put at the mercy of the current. It is a mistake to think that these outrages are the spontaneous outburst of the people's feeling in the provinces. They are presumably directed from headquarters, just as are the operations of the ladrones.

It will surprise most people to learn that the new church has got its canonized saint. Dr. José Rizal was solemnly canonized by Gregorio Aglipay about a year ago. The Aglipayans may now pray to him as a glorious saint in heaven and take him for their model. It is hard to see, however, what Rizal had done to entitle him to these honors. He had the Filipino vice of ingratitude abnormally developed. He set his father on an unjust no-rent agitation against the Dominican friars, to whose fostering care his family owed all they possessed, for they came to the estate very poor. He carried on traitorous practices for years, pretending all the while such friendship for the Spaniards that he was treated with great consideration even after he had been found out. He lived publicly for

years with a woman to whom he was not married, and only consented to marriage an hour before his death, in order to receive the last rites of the Church. But all these defects are forgotten in the fact that he died for his country, or, rather, was executed for treason against what was looked on as the mother country. He was not a hero, but he must be made one; he was a sinner, but he must be made a saint of, for he was the founder of the "Liga Filipina" and the life and soul of the Katipunan. Patriotism being the great virtue recognized by the new political church, José Rizal, the patriot, must be its first canonized saint. Rizal is quoted by his Filipino admirers as having expressed the sentiment that he could never bear the white faces. Whether this is true or not, it is believed; and it appears to me that the Rizal cult, though helped on by the Americans, will foster that racial antipathy which is growing more pronounced every day in the Philippines.

At the beginning of the schism Aglipay got sympathy from many Americans in the Philippines, including Mr. Taft, the Governor, but the current of public opinion seems to have turned against him. I was told that the great majority of the American teachers were sympathizers, but in the cases that came under my own observation I observed the contrary. It will not take long for the people of the United States to pass a correct judgment on him and his work when events shape themselves in the form to which they seem to be inevitably tending.

AMBROSE COLEMAN, O. P.

Limerick Ireland.

Scientific Chronicle

PHOTOGRAPHY AND ASTRONOMICAL RESEARCH.

Dr. Perrine's recent discovery of two new satellites of Jupiter, the sixth and seventh, makes an appropriate occasion for recording some of the wonderful aid the art of photography has given and is giving to astronomical research. This application of photography is not much over fifty years old, for although Dr. J. W. Draper made some experiments in 1840, and Bond, of Cambridge (U. S.), obtained his famous daguerreotype of the moon in 1850, it was not until in 1853 Warren de la Rue applied the collodion process of photography, then about two years old, that any systematic and continued work was undertaken. The possibilities of the "wet" plate were, however, limited. To the possibilities of the "dry" plate, first made available, as far as we know, by Dr. Huggins in 1876, there is seemingly no end. Increase in sensitiveness was accompanied by sensitiveness to the rays of the infra-red portion of the spectrum, until the whole solar spectrum could be photographed by means of the so-called autochromatic plate.

The human eye is marvelously sensitive to light, but in two ways it is surpassed by a sensitive film; the eye cannot accumulate impressions, while the film can do so almost indefinitely. Neither is the eye sensitive to many rays which easily make an impression on a film. Consequently, given a sufficiently long exposure, the camera will reveal stars, nebulae and comets in spaces in the heavens that would remain void to the human retina, even if it were assisted by the most powerful telescope. Added to this power of accumulation is that of registering much at once that the eye could only take in piecemeal. Many vast nebulae have been revealed in this way and their forms determined. Light has been shed on their formation and constitution, and in many cases our knowledge of their existence is due to the photographs we have made of them. We have even been enabled to trace changes in their form, and measure the velocity with which they are expanding or contracting. Most wonderful of all, recent studies have shown that there is no part of the heavens free from nebulae and that they exist in each part in great numbers. All this and more is accomplished with the utmost facility. Take the discovery of the asteroids as an example. Four of them had been discovered in 1807, and no more were found for nearly forty years. It took Hencke fifteen years to find a fifth. Wolf, of Heidelberg, enlisted photography in the

campaign, and now they are discovered at the rate of a dozen or more in a year. Six new ones were discovered last January. Oxygen, supposed for a time to be a purely terrestrial element, was detected in a star through the photography of its spectrum. Years of progress are made in a day, and accuracy, of such importance in astronomy, is increased; whatever faults there may be can be ascribed with justice to errors of mechanism or judgment.

In two fields of astronomical research the camera has proved especially valuable, that is in investigating the nebulous regions of the sky and in mapping out the entire heavens, including all stars of the fourteenth magnitude and over. The forms of *nebulae* would in many cases have remained unknown if photographs had not been secured of them. This was because of their faintness or because of the small area visible to the eye at any one moment. The eye would have to pass from one part of the nebula to another, even if it were easily visible; whereas it was recorded at once and in its full proportions on a sensitive plate. Who would think when gazing at the Pleiades that instead of the eight or ten stars easily visible therein with the naked eye there are actually over two thousand; that nearly all the larger stars of the constellation which we can see easily have *nebulae* attached to them, and that seven aligned stars can be seen on the photograph strung on a nebulous filament, "like beads on a rosary," as a writer has described them?

At the suggestion of Dr. Gill, director of the Royal Observatory at the Cape of Good Hope, an International Congress met in Paris in 1887 and resolved to construct a photographic chart of the whole heavens. The work is now fully three-fourths done, and an idea of its extent can be gathered from the fact that it will take 11,000 negatives to complete it, each negative to be duplicated; it will contain, according to estimate, impressions of twenty million stars, and will be supplemented by a catalogue giving stars to the eleventh magnitude. One can easily judge of the usefulness of this astro-graphic chart. Not the least purpose it will serve will be the rapid detection of any new star that may blaze out suddenly, as did Nova Persei in 1901.

THE TANTALUM LAMP.

Last year the twenty-fifth anniversary of the introduction of the Edison incandescent lamp was celebrated with becoming festivities and with new honors for the inventor. During the last quarter of a century this lamp has ruled with undisputed sway, at least in

the United States. Now a new lamp appears to dispute that sovereignty; the tantalum lamp, introduced to the scientific world by the well-known firm of Siemens & Halske, in whose laboratories it has been devised. As is well known, the filament of the Edison lamp is made of carbon obtained by acting on a thin filament of bamboo by means of sulphuric acid and charring it. Few other substances could withstand the high temperatures involved. Even the carbon is vaporized after a time, and the vapor is condensed on the inside of the bulb, causing the blackening of the bulb familiar to users of incandescent lights. The lamp is not as economical as it might be. A lamp with a filament of pure metal has been long desired, and one has been prepared.

Messrs. Siemens & Halske have been experimenting for years to obtain an incandescent material that would bear a very high temperature. The account of their researches tells us that they had early come to the conclusion that the visible part of the radiation of an incandescent body increases progressively with its temperature. The higher the temperature, the more light will be obtained. Consequently a material that will withstand the highest temperature will furnish the most economical lamp. Certain metals were known with melting points supposed to be considerably above 2,000 degrees Centigrade. Vanadium, niobium and tantalum, rare elements of the nitrogen group, are three of these. Dr. W. von Bolton undertook for the firm the task of finding out which of these three, if any of them, was suitable for the purpose in view. In the course of his experimenting he determined that the melting point of tantalum alone was above 2,000 degrees C., the figure for this element when pure being 2,250 to 2,300 degrees C. The figures for vanadium and niobium were 1,680 degrees C. and 1,950 degrees C., respectively.

It required considerable time to get tantalum in its pure state. We quote Dr. Bolton's own description of his experiments: "I reduced potassium tantalum-fluoride in the manner prescribed by Berzelius and Rose and found that the finely divided tantalum so produced became fairly coherent on rolling, so that by this treatment metallic strips of it could be made. It was also attempted to work tantalum oxide into the shape of a filament by mixing it with paraffin and to reduce it directly into the form of a metallic thread. In these experiments there was observed for the first time a minute globule of molten tantalum, and this globule was of sufficient toughness to permit hammering and drawing into wire. Following out this observation, tantalum powder was melted in a vacuum and then it was found that the highly heated metal parted with the gases it contained. In this manner I produced my first

filaments of pure metallic tantalum, which were, however, very small. When these had been used in lamps with promise of good results, an attempt was made to devise a definite process of purification. The potassium tantalum-fluoride was reduced to metallic powder; this powder contains a small proportion of oxide and of hydrogen which is absorbed during the reduction. When the powder was melted in a vacuum the oxide and absorbed gas disappeared and a reguline metal remained; on carefully remelting this it became so pure that no appreciable impurities could be detected in it."

The chemical properties of this pure tantalum were found to be very different from the properties of the tantalum described by other chemists, and rendered it eminently suitable for use in an incandescent lamp. On December 28, 1902, the first lamp was made. As it was further improved it was shown that the wire had a tendency to droop when hot, and since the wire necessary had to be more than two feet long, it was obviously impossible to wind it into a spiral; it must be supported in some other way. Experience showed that the best support consisted of a central short glass rod carrying two disks into which arms, bent upward and downward in the shape of an umbrella, are cast. "The upper star," we quote from Dr. O. Treverlein, who devised the mechanical portion of the lamp, "has eleven, the lower twelve arms, each upper arm being in a vertical plane midway between the vertical planes in which two adjacent lower arms lie. Between these eleven and twelve arms, which are bent into hooks at their ends, the entire length of the filament is drawn zigzag fashion. Its extremities, held by two of the lower arms, are connected with the foot of the lamp by means of platinum wires."

Of the efficiency of the new lamp he writes: "Numerous trials for lengthy periods of time at 1 to 3 watts per candle-power have proved the vast superiority of the tantalum lamp over the carbon filament lamp under equal electric and photometric conditions. Expressing this fact in figures, we can state that the tantalum lamp consumes about 50 per cent. less current at the same voltage, with the same intensity of light and the same useful life; or that, at the same economy, its life is several times that of the carbon type. Moreover, at an initial efficiency of 1.5 volts per Hefner candle-power the tantalum lamp has an average life quite sufficient for all practical requirements, so that this rating has been standardized for the 110-volt lamp. Trials have also proved that the lamps have a life of several hundred hours at 1 watt per Hefner candle-power, but in that case they were very sensitive to variations of pressure and often showed an early decrease of illuminating power. The

useful life of the tantalum lamp—i. e., the time within which it loses 20 per cent. of its initial illuminating power—averages between 400 and 600 hours at 1.5 watts per Hefner candle-power. Some specimens have proved to have a useful life of as much as 1,200 hours. The absolute life, in general, amounts to 800 to 1,000 hours under normal working conditions. Further, we have to remark that the tantalum lamp blackens but little unless it has been strongly overheated during work in consequence of partial short circuiting of the filament."

The osmium lamp, used in Germany for some time, has some of these advantages, but the metal is much rarer than tantalum and has bad mechanical properties. All three lamps possess the property of increasing in candle power for a certain length of time and then gradually decreasing. Tantalum is classed among the rare metals, but there seems to be enough for making lamp filaments, as a pound will make some 20,000 of them. In an editorial in the *Electrical World and Engineer* for January 28 of this year an opinion of the lamp is given which will show how the lamp is judged by an expert. "We are inclined to look upon this tantalum lamp seriously as the first important step taken toward a new order of things in incandescent lighting. A glow lamp with a filament of pure metal has much in its favor, and when this metal is refractory enough to stand incandescence up to an efficiency of two watts per candle-power, it begins to look as if something were doing. A two-watt incandescent lamp, it is almost needless to say, can give the electric arc a very hard struggle to retain its supremacy, especially the enclosed arc. We shall await the appearance of the tantalum lamp in commercial practice with great interest, for if it meets the claims of life and efficiency now made for it, the art of electric lighting will have much to be thankful for."

A NOVEL METHOD OF PLANT-FORCING.

On viewing the gorgeous display of flowers in the show windows of our flower merchants the average layman, if he think of the matter at all, will occasionally ask himself how it is that the florist can make winter blossom like the spring and summer. To say that the instrument of his magic is the hothouse, and that the operation is known as forcing is to reply without answering. To satisfy his curiosity our layman must know more. Perhaps a brief resumé of some recent investigations on the subject will supply him with this additional knowledge. These investigations well

illustrate the use science can make of natural phenomena for industrial profit.

Every one can recognize an invariable cycle in the life of plants. After flowering and fruiting in the spring and summer they shed their leaves in autumn and are inactive and apparently dead in winter. A prolonged drought will have much the same effect. But let the spring warmth approach and continue for a few days, and in a surprisingly short time, remarkable to one not familiar with or not observant of plant life and growth, the trees and shrubs have broken into delicate leafage. Horticulturists sometimes say that the plants have awakened; they call their inactive period the period of sleep, and the saying "put a plant to sleep" is frequently used, although in many cases the expression is undoubtedly figurative. But among some plant physiologists this time of inaction is beginning to be looked upon as being a response to some demand of the plant's nature, sometimes increased by the exterior influences of cold, prolonged dryness and the like. Thus this state can be brought about artificially, and if this is done just before the plants bloom the time of blooming can be somewhat retarded. This is one method of forcing. Another consists in taking the plant before it has quite entered upon its period of sleep and in drying it thoroughly. This violent treatment seems to accomplish in six weeks or so what nature takes all winter to bring about, for when the plant is placed in good soil and kept at a temperature of about 90 degrees Fahrenheit, it blooms as it would in spring. Success does not always reward the efforts of the florist; the state of the autumn weather has much influence. However, this method, or some modification of it, is used extensively to secure blossoms out of season.

A Danish scientist, M. Johannsen, has discovered a new way of accomplishing in a day or two what took six weeks in the method just described. It has been known for a number of years that ether and chloroform arrest the development of plants if applied in any quantity; whereas if they were used in very feeble doses they had quite the opposite effect. The Danish professor conceived the idea of utilizing this property of plants in order to force their buds into premature bloom. For this purpose he selected some branches of the willow tree on which buds had already formed and placed them in a vessel with a little ether. After twenty-four hours these branches were plunged into water and planted side by side with some untreated branches, and in two days the buds of the former had opened, while those of the latter had remained unopened.

The details of the commercial application of this process need not detain us. It is successful. Very few failures occur, and plants are in flower four or five months earlier than they would have been under the old treatment.

NOTES.

SOME RECENT CELESTIAL PHENOMENA.—During the first two weeks of February a great spot was visible on the sun. It could be easily seen with the naked eye through smoked or tinted glass. In the aggregate it was nearly 90,000 miles long and about half as broad. During the month nine groups of smaller dark spots and eight groups of faculæ were visible at one time. A sun-spot maximum which is due is either near us or upon us. The following is a good summary of the present status of our knowledge of sun spots. It is taken from *Popular Astronomy* for March: "The sun spot is generally considered to be an irregular, black hollow formed in the solar surface by a collection of cooler gases that overload its surface at that place and thereby cause a sink in it, or, if there is less pressure from beneath the surface than the ordinary amount from any cause, the sinking of a portion of it may be caused by its own weight. Surrounding this black patch is a dark cape that is brighter on its inner surface and less so on its outer. Near the outer edge of this penumbral cape and in its vicinity on all sides are pores through which immense volumes of gases are pouring out from the interior of the sun. This condition causes great activity to be apparent usually on all sides of the spot or group of spots which appears to be the centre of the so-called solar storm that is in progress. This plainly gives what may be called a kind of vertical circulation of the solar masses in the region under consideration, an uprush of the highly heated vapors in and near the outer border of the penumbra and a downrush of the cooler vapors that descend through the dark hollow of the spot called its umbra. The depth of sun spots below the general level is very hard to determine. Astronomers think it may vary in different spots from 500 to 2,000 miles. The sizes of different spots vary greatly, and the dimensions of the same spot are not usually the same from day to day. This was notably the case in the great group during the first days of last month. What has been said about uncertainty of the depth and size of the sun spot is equally true of its life or time of existence. It may last a few days or it may exist for more than a whole year. One sun spot has been known to live for eighteen months."

The second magnitude star Castor, in the constellation Gemini, has long been known as a double star. Nine years ago a Russian astronomer discovered that the fainter of the two components had a dark companion. Dr. Curtis, of Lick Observatory, has just discovered that the brighter component has a companion also. The discovery was made by means of the instrument called the spectrograph, which is adding yearly to the thousands of binary star systems already known.

NEW YEAR'S EVE TIME SIGNALS.—On New Year's Eve the United States Naval Observatory sent out telegraphic time signals. The first series lasted five minutes, ending at midnight, 75th meridian time, and was repeated at 1, 2 and 3 A. M. An effort had been made to get all the cable and telegraph companies of the world to coöperate, so that the signals could be sent around the world, but some of the companies declined on the plea of too much business. The signals reached Australia in less than three seconds and Argentina in less than eight. At that rate time signals may be sent around the globe in ten or fifteen seconds. Similar experiments had been made on December 31, 1903, and on September 8, 1904. They have for their main object to make clear the possibility of using one central time centre for the entire commercial world and to bring about, if possible, the universal adoption of standard time and of longitude reckoned from one meridian, that of Greenwich.

TWO NEW SATELLITES OF JUPITER.—On January 4 of this year Professor C. D. Perrine, of Lick Observatory, Mount Hamilton, California, announced that he had discovered a sixth satellite of the planet Jupiter. He had suspected its presence in December last by his photographic study of the satellite system of the planet. On the day following the announcement Dr. Perrine resumed his study of the negatives and discovered a seventh satellite, its nature being clearly shown by its change of position from night to night. Both are very faint bodies, and their distances from Jupiter are given as lying between 6,000,000 and 8,000,000 miles. This makes the sixth discovery of a satellite by an American astronomer. In August, 1877, Professor Asaph Hall discovered two satellites to Mars. Professor E. E. Barnard, in 1892, discovered Jupiter's fifth satellite, and in 1898 Professor W. H. Pickering discovered the ninth satellite of Saturn by photographic aid.

THE SEEDLESS APPLE.—The seedless orange has become so common that we have almost forgotten that it was a dream a compara-

tively few years ago. Now comes the seedless apple, due to the propagating skill and care of Mr. John F. Spencer, of Grand Junction, Colorado. Several years' work was necessary before he was rewarded with five seedless apple trees. Now he has two thousand, and estimate gives three hundred and seventy-five thousand as the number of nursery trees to be expected by the fall of 1905, and two and a half million by 1906. The apples are coreless, too, and the trees bear no blossoms. This means that the apple will be wormless, for the codling moth will be prevented from depositing its eggs. Loss of fruit from the killing of blossoms by frost will probably be a thing of the past.

COMPLETION OF THE SIMPLON TUNNEL.—On February 24 the boring of this great tunnel was completed. The work has taken six and one-half years and has cost \$15,700,000. From 500 to 700 feet per month was the best rate of advance attained. The success of this low level tunnel is likely to lead to others in the future.

INVAR.—A measuring wire that will not expand with rise of temperature, a pendulum whose length will increase so little that it will not vary more than two seconds in twenty-four hours, these are some of the results the new alloy "Invar" will bring about. Professor Guillaume, of Paris, introduced "Invar," which is steel containing about 36 per cent. of nickel, which is characterized by possessing an extremely small coefficient of expansion or by the fact that its specific volume is practically invariable when considered as a function of the temperature." Professor Guillaume has a 24 per cent. nickel alloy which will do away with costly compensation in watches. He has besides a 45 per cent. nickel alloy which can replace platinum in the incandescent lamp.

M. J. AHERN, S. J.

Boston, Mass.

Book Reviews

THE HOUSE OF GOD AND OTHER ADDRESSES AND STUDIES. By the *Very Rev. Thomas J. Shahan, D. D.*, of the Catholic University of America. 12mo., pp. 428. New York: The Catholic Library Association, 534 Amsterdam Avenue.

It is always a great pleasure to receive anything new from the pen of Dr. Shahan, and his contributions to literature are so rich and meritorious that it is a pleasure to meet them again and again. His learning, his reasoning, his power of expression all combine to make him an exceptionally valuable writer. In his latest volume we have a collection of sermons, lectures, addresses and essays used at various times, but not before brought together for publication. They all show the same careful, conscientious student, the same clear thinker and the same able teacher whom we have before and whom we love to meet again. Dr. Shahan has taught us to look up to a very high standard, and he never lowers it. The present collection offers strong temptations to quote, which we shall not try to resist. See this beautiful description of the House of God taken from an address delivered at the dedication of St. Cecilia's Church, Brooklyn:

"In the venerable books which the Church uses to-day, the Roman Pontifical and Missal, the House of God is described as a city stoutly built upon the mountain-top. Her bulwarks and streets are made of pure gold; her gates are fashioned of rare marbles and inlaid with tiers of brightest pearls; sapphires and emeralds adorn her high walls, which are patrolled by hosts of shining angels, and the vast spaces of this celestial city are radiant with the divine light that glows from the throne of the Lord God Almighty. Human language is scarcely capable of uttering the splendid vision of beauty which unrolls before the prophetic eye of Holy Church as she describes to her children the outward aspect of the New Jerusalem. But the Church, which is the spouse of Christ, and therefore the closest sharer of His intimacy, knows more of this marvelous city than its external semblance. It is a place, she tells us, where the prayers of the unhappy and the afflicted are heard; where the sins and transgressions of the world are cleansed; where Christ dwells in unbroken intercourse with His spouse; where the tears and agonies of the spiritual combat are forgotten. It is the home of the multitude, the common resort of the humble and the lowly, the refuge of the outcast and despised. It is the gate of heaven, the vestibule of paradise—a holy, hallowed and a dreadful place, filled ever with the unspeakable majesty of God and echoing

to the adoring whispers of the angelic presences and a rapturous spiritual music too delicate for our gross mortal ears to comprehend."

How striking are these thoughts on the office of the priesthood:

"Venerable brethren, we are the last comers in a long line of priests that stretches back to the Apostles, and in them to the Cross and Cenacle. Our history is the history of the world since first we were sent out into it, the agents and vicars of Jesus Christ. And when all is told, we may be proud of those who went before us. Que homines, they sustained well the shock of conflict, they stood brave and united about the standard of Christ, they delivered to us unimpaired the lessons of His life and His teachings. Like the Lampadophori or torch-bearers in the games of Greece, they have handed down, one to another, through all the centuries, the living flame of knowledge and piety. And we may well turn, as King Ahasuerus did, to the annals of the past to draw comfort therefrom and direction—we shall not be deceived. Quae regio in terris nostri non plena laboris! What culture of the Orient so high and old that we have not conquered it for Christ! What barbarism so pallid and spent that we have not stooped to lift it from the horrors of its moral death! What powers 'in excelsis' that we have not manfully withstood in defense of the rights and ideals of humanity! What patience and persistency have we not shown in dealing with our own selves and in judging, Rhadamanthus-like, with stern severity every lapse from the ideal of our estate and our calling! All other priesthoods were local, temporary, natural, human and imperfect. This alone transcends all time and dominates humanity, taking wings with the rise and accommodating its steps to the decline of man in his varied and successive combinations."

We could go on quoting indefinitely, for these compositions are made up of just such gems as those which we have shown. The book is altogether charming and instructive.

IRELAND'S STORY. A short history of Ireland for schools, reading circles and general readers. By *Charles Johnston*, author of "Ireland: Historic and Picturesque." 12mo., pp. x.—414. Illustrated. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

"Ireland's Story" has been written not as a record of the dead past, but as a beacon for the living future. It is inspired by a belief in the Irish race, now spread far beyond its island home, through many lands, beneath many skies. The Irish race has a great part to play in the history of the future; and present and future can be understood only by a knowledge of the past.

The story of Ireland may be viewed in many ways. First, as a part of universal history; its ancient traditions are rich and full of clues to the races of the early world; its archaic treasures are abundant; its old stone monuments wonderfully preserved. In illuminating the shadowy dawn of early Europe, and especially of those northern lands whose children now lead the world, no country can aid us so much as Ireland.

Then we must reckon Ireland's early heroic poems and tales, ampler than those of any European land, save only Greece and Italy, and giving us the truest and richest picture of the archaic life of Europe, still untouched by Greece and Rome. The great personages of the Irish epics stand out as clear as the heroic figures who fought around Troy or inspired the leaders of Attica and Sparta and the City of the Seven Hills.

Next comes Ireland's part in the drama of faith. Ireland may well be called the Ark of the Covenant; for in the little western isle was stored up the treasure of the Gospel, brought thither first by Patrick. Preserved miraculously from the barbarian raids which swept away the Roman Empire and covered Europe with heathen conquerors, this treasure was presently brought forth and carried abroad, first to Great Britain, then to Belgium and France, Switzerland, Germany and Austria, Italy and Spain and even to the twilight confines of Norway and Iceland. Beautiful illuminated manuscripts from Ireland rekindled the learning of Europe, after the barbarian conquests of the Goths and Vandals, Angles and Franks.

From the following epochs of Ireland's story there are many lessons to be learned, but the best of them is this: that in the life of nations there works a providential destiny, not only in prosperity, but in adversity, and perhaps most of all in adversity; that in Ireland's life this Providence working through conquest, oppression and misery, has miraculously preserved the pure spirit of the race in its pristine unworldliness and faith, its belief in holiness and in the spiritual world, and that this spirit so preserved and now dispersed through many lands, is to-day one of the great treasures of humanity.

Every reader of the Irish race will find here a tale to make him proud of his parentage and his inheritance; a tale of valor and endurance, a tale of genius and inspiration, a tale of self-sacrifice and faith. Such a one thus looking back proudly to a worthy and noble past may look forward with hope for the future and with a sense of consecration for the spiritual destiny of the Irish race.

So much for the subject. Now for the author. He is thus described by an admirer:

"Mr. Johnston is a ripe scholar, a man of varied attainments, a

wide traveler and accomplished linguist, a thinker, a man of the world and a clever writer in a great many fields. He was born in Ballykilbeg, in the County Down, Ireland, in 1867, and was educated in the Dublin University. Mr. Johnston is the son of the late William J. Johnston, M. P., of Belfast, better known as Johnston of Ballykilbeg, long famous as one of the most vigorous, persistent and yet honest opponents of Nationalism in Ireland; yet out of this cradle of things anti-National, with an educational training and official experience calculated to make his antipathies deeper and more lasting, he has come by sheer force of native honesty, spiritual sincerity and intellectual independence, to be one of the most earnest, logical and outspoken advocates of Nationalism and Celticism Ireland has produced in this decade. Tory and anti-Nationalist, landlord and master of an Orange lodge as the father was, he was a kindly, lovable, charitable old man, a good neighbor, a considerate master utterly devoid of the persecutor's spirit and after his lights a sturdy lover of his country; and not the least of his son's triumphs was that of his book 'Ireland' and his attitude on affairs Irish, made the sturdy old father in his declining years acknowledge that he was wrong and his son was right."

With an author so well fitted to his subject good results should follow. The reader will not expect literary display or dissertations on the philosophy of history in a 12mo. volume of 414 pages which begins with the legendary races 2,000 years before Christ and ends with the Irish in America and in the British Empire at the present time. The book is a very brief, though complete, rapid sketch of Irish history from a sympathetic though truthful pen, well done and attractively put together. It stands alone.

HISTORY OF THE GERMAN PEOPLE SINCE THE CLOSE OF THE MIDDLE AGES.
By *Johannes Janssen*. Vols. VII and VIII. Translated by A. M. Christie.
St. Louis: B. Herder. Price for both volumes, \$6.25, net.

These two volumes, representing Volume IV. of the German original, carry the history of Germany through the wild period which intervened between the hollow "Pacification" patched up at the Diet of Augsburg in 1555, down to the equally hollow "Formula of Concord" promulgated in 1580. All hope of restoring religious unity in the "Holy Empire" had been abandoned; and, in accordance with the terms of the Peace of Augsburg, each petty prince was made supreme lord and master of the consciences of his subjects. The only bond of union amongst the Protestant rulers, then as now, was their common hatred of the Catholic Church, from which they had apostatized. Unless when roused to united action

against the Catholics, Protestantism presented the wretched spectacle, characteristic of all heretical sects from the beginning, of endless and hopeless divisions and sub-divisions. Not only did the original cleavage between Lutheranism and Calvinism still continue to exist in the Protestant ranks, but within the Lutheran party itself the discord of the "theologians" gave rise to perpetual schisms and unseemly wrangling. The bare enumeration of these sects, each of which, in true Lutheran style, consigned all the others to hell-fire, would fill a whole page of this REVIEW. The story has been repeatedly told, oftenest by Protestant writers, but by no one in so masterly a way as by Janssen. With no attempt at rhetoric, and for the most part permitting the actors to state their case in their own words, his narrative moves along with almost epic dignity. No historian has ever surpassed him in the art of marshaling his facts, keeping always in view the logical sequence of events. His description of the revolt of the Netherlands and of the religious wars of France, backed by contemporary documents, will be found particularly valuable.

Janssen is at his best when he turns from this discordant Babel to consider the majestic figure of the Catholic Church. The most interesting chapters of the present volumes are those devoted to the Council of Trent, the Roman catechism and the heroic efforts of the German Jesuits under their incomparable chief, Bl. Peter Canisius. In the following passage, summing up the results of the labors of the Fathers of Trent, he becomes eloquent:

"Herewith the dogmatic work of the Council was finished. From out the well-nigh untraversable coil of reproaches, attacks, misrepresentations and calumnies, which half a century had wound round the Catholic Church, her likeness now stood forth pure and spotless, and in complete inner accord as to doctrinal and moral teaching, organization and worship. Her dogmatic connection with the apostolic past was clearly set forth at all points; the reform had been grounded, not on externals, but on the inward sanctification both of individual life and of the universal community of the Church."

The translation, though not as perfect as so accurate a work should be, is a great improvement upon the earlier volumes. For the benefit of those who shall wish to read Janssen intelligently, we give a list of all the errors that obscure or pervert the sense. In Volume VII., page 36, read "letter of Duke Julius." On page 60 read Frederic II. The "George Grenger" mentioned on page 200 was not an *opponent*, but a *defender* of the false opinions of Constance and Basle. Likewise, page 294, *Musculus verfocht* means Musculus fought *for*, not *against*. On page 317 read *Peace of Augsburg* instead of *Augsburg Confession*. On page 44 of Volume VIII.,

read *William* instead of *Frederic*. On page 83, read "submission of Prussia to Poland." On page 86, read "Luebeck must cut off." On page 134, John Casimir leads troops, not *against*, but *in aid of* the Huguenots. Same page, read "salaries paid by France to German Princes." Page 150, line 19, read year 1566. Page 170, line 10, *Turk* should be *work*. Page 176, read "who had defended Brenz" instead of "whom Brenz had defended." On page 203, by rendering "mein Herr Vater" with "my lord's father" the whole sentence is made nonsensical. Page 286, "*worship of Mary*" is a poor rendition of *Marienverehrung*. An English Catholic would have said *veneration of Mary*. On pages 309 and 310 the translator has made Janssen's narrative of the intrigues of Count Joachim of Ortenburg quite unintelligible by twice styling the Count a *Duke*. Finally, on page 349, read Elector Palatine instead of Count Palatine.

These are all the errors of any moment which we have discovered during a very careful perusal of the two volumes. Whilst they might and ought to have been avoided in so scientific a work, the prime characteristic of which is absolute accuracy, yet they do not seriously impair the general excellence of the translation, and we extend to the translator and to the publishers our sincere congratulations. They have fully supplied the want which was so keenly felt of a complete and thoroughly reliable work in English on the subject of the Lutheran Reformation. It may take some time to upset inveterate myths and lies, but in the end the truth will prevail.

A LIFE OF SHAKESPEARE. By *William J. Rolfe, Litt. D.* One volume, cloth, 8vo., illustrated, \$3.00. Same, one-half morocco, \$5.00. Boston: Dana Estes & Co.

"This monumental work includes all the known facts and reasonable conjectures regarding the life and works of Shakespeare, treating among other matters of his ancestry and birth, education, marriage, life at Stratford and London, literary production, closing years and death, and the subsequent history of the poet's family. The notes, index and bibliography are unusually full, and the book contains the most complete account of the typographical peculiarities of the first folio that can be found in any authority. Doctor Rolfe gives, so far as his limits allow, the evidence for the facts of Shakespeare's life, and the reasons for accepting or rejecting current traditions and conjectures. He has been notably fair in stating theories of other scholars which he has felt obliged to criticize, and has generally allowed the advocates of different views to speak for themselves, thus permitting the reader to judge as to which authority

is in the right. Together with full critical discussion of the various plays, Dr. Rolfe has given in this volume a more detailed analysis of the 'Poems' than has been before attempted in a work of this character. Above all, the book is human, vital and sympathetic, and will prove as fascinating to the lay reader as it is valuable to the scholar. The volume contains over 550 pages, printed from new type on heavy paper, and with wide margins. It is illustrated with eight full-page etchings and photogravures."

Thus for the publisher. The author says:

"My aim has been to give the main facts, traditions and conjectures concerning Shakespeare's personal and literary history, adding so far as my limits allow the evidence for the facts and the reasons for accepting or rejecting the traditions and conjectures. Biographers have never agreed and probably will never agree on many of these doubted or disputed matters. I have endeavored to be fair in stating theories and opinions which I feel obliged to criticize, generally letting their authors or advocates speak for themselves, and leaving the reader to judge whether they are right or I am.

"More than one biographer has begun by quoting what George Steevens wrote somewhat more than a hundred years ago: 'All that is known with any degree of certainty concerning Shakespeare is that he was born at Stratford-on-Avon; married and had children there; went to London, where he commenced as an actor and wrote poems and plays; returned to Stratford, made his will, died, and was buried.' And Tennyson is reputed to have said: 'The world should be thankful that there are but five facts known to us about Shakespeare: the date of his birth, April 23, 1564; his marriage at nineteen to Anne Hathaway; his connection with the Globe Theatre and with Blackfriars; his retirement from theatrical life with a competency to Stratford, and the date of his death, which took place upon the anniversary of his birth, 1616.'"

The book may be said to have come into life through tribulation. In the preface we read:

"The manuscript of this Life was finished, except for the notes, in May, 1901, and from the beginning of June to the middle of September was kept in a safety vault at Cambridge. In October it mysteriously disappeared from my library. Though I had little doubt by whom it was taken, the evidence was purely circumstantial; and for that and other reasons it was impossible for me to make any effort to regain possession of it. The person who took it intended after reading it to return it without betraying himself, but he was afterwards tempted to put it into other hands with a false statement of its history, possibly with a view to its being

utilized, in part if not as a whole, in print. This can hardly be done with safety, but it has complicated the affair and interfered with the return of the manuscript in time for it to go to press as promised.

"I have therefore been compelled to undertake the depressing task of rewriting it, and the present volume is the result. Whether it is better for being twice-told I cannot say, but I am inclined to think it is no worse."

It may be well to say to the purchasers of the New Century (subscription) edition of Shakespeare that this life was written as a supplement to that book, and to other persons that this is the first time that it has appeared independently. We feel that Dr. Rolfe's reputation as a Shakespearean scholar and writer makes further comment unnecessary.

THE SUFFERING MAN-GOD (L'Homme-Dieu Souffrant), or, The Divinity of Jesus Christ Resplendent in His Sufferings. By *Pere Seraphim, Passionist*. Translated by Lillian M. Ward. 12mo., pp. 239. London: R. & T. Washbourne. New York: Benziger Brothers.

Although it may be said that most standard subjects, even including those of a sacred character and those of the spiritual order, have been treated so frequently and in such various ways as to be practically exhausted, and although it may be suspected that the multiplication of books on some of these subjects rather confuse than enlighten the public mind, there is one grand exception, and it is the Divinity of Christ. On this subject by far too little has been written, and it is so deep and so many sided as to be exhaustless. We cannot help thinking that if more short treatises or tracts were made on the subject from different standpoints and scattered broadcast over the world, that infidelity would be put to flight. Infidelity is the meanest and ugliest cur in the manger, and all curs are cowards.

The book before us is an illustration of the thought in our mind. In it the author leaves the beaten path and attempts what at first might be an impossible task, to trace the Divinity of the Saviour throughout the different stages of His Passion. He thus declares his own purpose:

"The Divinity of Jesus Christ is not a question to be discussed; it is a fundamental principle solidly established, outside of which no other foundation can be laid. 'The Word was made Flesh and dwelt amongst us . . . full of grace and truth' (St. John i., 14). These simple and sublime words of the Apostle St. John established at once the Divinity of Jesus Christ, and they contain at the same

time the announcement of the supernatural position to which man was raised by Him.

"In placing the Divinity of Jesus Christ as the basis of religious belief, these words would have us understand that the Word was made Flesh—the Son of God became Man. Jesus Christ is the only door, as it were, by which God has come personally to us and the only means by which we can penetrate into the infinite treasures of His Divine Being. When we speak of the Divinity of our Saviour in this work we do not regard it as a question which requires to be either elucidated or proved; we speak of it as an already established principle from which we must start in order to draw the salutary conclusions which emanate from it and which will lead us to procure for ourselves that eternal happiness to which we all aspire.

"Glancing at the Gospels we see everywhere reflected the Divinity of Jesus Christ. Taking them page by page it would be easy for us to write a large volume on this subject, so worthy of the study of every true Christian. In this little work we have confined ourselves to the one drama of the Passion of our Saviour. We have endeavored to show how the Divinity of Jesus shines forth resplendent in the midst of the insults and abasements of His Sorrowful Passion, and how the humiliation and sufferings which He endured, far from detracting from His Divinity, do but serve to show it forth with a more brilliant splendor."

INSTITUTIONES METAPHYSICAE SPECIALIS quas tradebat in collegio maximo Lovaniensi. *P. Stanislaus de Backer, S. J.* Tom. III. *Psychologia pars altera. Psychologia De Vita Rationali.* Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne et Cie, 117 Rue de Rennes, 1904. Pp. 288.

With the present volume Father de Backer's "Special Metaphysics" reaches the close of the second stage of its development. The preceding ground was covered by one volume on "Cosmology" and another on "Organic and Empirical Psychology." The volume at hand completes the psychological section by furnishing the speculative or more purely metaphysical side of the subject. In respect to its object matter it is the most important of the entire work; for in it the nature, origin and destiny of the human soul are explained and established in the light of principles partly gathered from the preceding discussions and partly carried on in the opening chapter of the present volume itself. In accord with the method dominating the work, the inductive-deductive, the superiority of the human mind over that of the animal is established at the outset on the basis of their respective activities. The way is thus prepared to demonstrate the spirituality and simplicity of the

principle of thought and volition in man. The author has wisely, we think, given the larger share of attention to the proof for the soul's existence, as a real substantial principle distinct from the organism, for here indeed is the crucial problem and the one against which the strongest attacks of empiricists are directed. Once the reality of the soul as an enduring substance is solidly established its specific properties can be demonstrated with comparatively little difficulty.

The relation of the soul to the body is treated by the author more succinctly than is usually the case in works of the kind, because subjects here pertinent, such as sleep, dreams, hypnotism and kindred phenomena, have been anticipated in the preceding volume, owing doubtless to their presenting a more physical than spiritual ingredient. It is also customary in kindred works to treat of the functions of the intellect and will prior to entering on the nature of their principle, the soul's nature. The author has inverted this procedure and given the former subjects the second place. He doubtless discovered an adequate advantage in thus arranging his material, though to the reviewer's thinking the logical no less than the practical interests of the work have not been thereby as well subserved as they would have been by the reverse order. However, the matter is one of only secondary importance.

For the rest we have only to reaffirm the opinion registered in our comments on the earlier portion of the work—the present volume like its predecessors continues the best traditions of philosophy as it has always been conserved in the society to which the author belongs. It is at once solid and thorough in argument, and yet unmistakably clear in method and exposition. The scholastic student can hardly fail to profit by its reading.

THE SPIRIT OF SACRIFICE AND THE LIFE OF SACRIFICE IN THE RELIGIOUS STATE. From the original of *Rev. S. M. Giraud*, Missionary Priest of Our Lady of La Salette. Revised by Rev. Herbert Thurston, S. J. 12mo., pp. 500. New York: Benziger Brothers.

In his preface the author speaks of the life of the monk and nun, second in excellence to the priesthood only, and of the many excellent writers who have been inspired by so grand a theme. He then speaks of his own purpose in these words:

"We, in our turn, have attempted to be of service to them in the work of their sanctification, a work of such vital importance. The treatise we now lay before the reader treats of the religious state from the special point of view of the victim's self surrender. We employ the word victim here, although on the title page of this

work we have preferred to speak of the life of sacrifice. The sense is the same in both, but we thought it best to make use of the latter term lest our announcement might seem to suggest some singularity of doctrine and practice. It will, however, be seen that the standpoint we have chosen is anything but a fanciful or unauthorized one. The view we take of the religious life is, in fact, by no means new; every author who has selected this beautiful subject as his theme points it out, but without enlarging upon it; whereas what we propose to consider in the religious state is pre-eminently the life of the monk or nun as a victim.

"We cannot but think that this view of the religious life is not only a true one, but also one which imparts to it a character eminently weighty, elevated, profound and calculated to inspire souls consecrated to God by solemn vows with more generous aspirations, holier dispositions. The contents of this work may be summarized as follows:

"1. The religious is, in very truth, a victim offered to God in union with Jesus Christ in His divine sacrifice.

"2. In this character he ought to be devoted entirely to God, to His interests, to His glory and completely sacrificed to His good pleasure.

"3. In order to accomplish this end his life is a life of humility, poverty, chastity, mortification, modesty, obedience.

"4. He takes delight in entire seclusion from the world and finds rest and peace in solitude and silence.

"5. Finally, charity, tender, strong, constant, supernatural charity, pervades and vivifies all that is in him and about him; his mind, his heart, his words, his actions; and thus he attains to the perfection of his state of self-surrender.

"Such, in a few words, is the faithful portraiture of the religious."

THE BURDEN OF THE TIME. Essays in Suggestion. Based upon certain of the Breviary Scriptures of the liturgical year. By *Rev. Cornelius Clifford*, Priest of the Diocese of Newark, author of "Introibo." 12mo., pp. xlii.—389. New York: Cathedral Library Association, 534 Amsterdam avenue.

In the present series of essays the author has gone once more for inspiration to the living liturgy of the Church. As in his former volume he sought to direct attention to the forgotten riches of the Sunday Introits, so in this his endeavor is to recall to the minds of his fellow-believers the profound suggestiveness for purposes of informal meditation of those Breviary Scriptures which the Roman See appoints for the consideration of her children, priest and layman alike, through all the weeks of the ecclesiastical year.

A glance at the substance of the reflections which the author has ventured provisionally to draw out in this direction will do more, perhaps, to explain his point of view than a detailed exposition by way of foreword could accomplish. He has approached these extracts, therefore—the *lectiones de Scriptura occurrente*—with the limitations of a homilete. Questions of criticism have not immediately concerned him. He has written in the spirit in which the Breviary was slowly compiled—the spirit of faith and enthusiasm for the most helpful portions of the Word of God and with a mind intent only on applying their present significance to latter-day Catholics. He has not aspired to logical completeness; much less has he pretended to exhaust the text. He has merely selected a few of the more striking utterances from each week's portion and discussed them according to his bent.

In the application which he has made of Scripture to present needs and problems the author has only had recourse to that chastened liberty of exegesis which is part of the constructive tradition of the Breviary itself. He has held preferably to the literal sense of passages wherever he could; but it will be seen that he has not been deaf to the deeper poetry of a more spiritual interpretation. The author has stated his purpose and plan so clearly that we shall not attempt to add anything except to say that he does not depart from them. Those who have seen the author's previous work, which attracted so much favorable attention as soon as it appeared, will not need any recommendation for its successor.

SUMMULA PHILOSOPHIAE SCHOLASTICAE in usum adolescentium Seminarii.
 B. Mariæ de Monte Melleario. Vol. II. Cosmologia et Psychologia.
 Dublini: Browne et Nolan, 1904. Pp. vi.—423.

The field is already so well covered with manuals of scholastic philosophy that one can hardly expect to present a new claimant to attention without confronting the question *cui bono*? Books of this class seem to be all pretty much the same both in contents and form. Why then multiply them so persistently? That some minor variation in detail or in mode of presentation may adapt one such book more closely to the needs or tastes of an individual professor than does another seems no adequate ground for claiming a wider lien on precious time and energy. To some extent this point of view is justified, and yet a closer study of the successively appearing manuals will usually show that each has a more potent *raison d'être* than appears at first sight. This will be obvious to any competent student or professor who will take the time to examine

carefully the modestly entitled *Summula* at hand. Though composed primarily, as its name indicates, for the use of the students at Mount Mellary, Ireland, it will serve the purpose of text-book or reference manual in any seminary or college wherein a course of two years philosophy is pursued. Its adaptability in this connection lies first in the fact that it puts within moderate compass the sum total of scholastic philosophy, avoiding the meagreness and probable obscurity of the mere synopsis or compendium on the one hand and the discursiveness of the voluminous cursus on the other. The author has drawn the essentials from the master works—St. Thomas, Suarez, Urrabuni, Pesch and the rest—and has succeeded in presenting them with singular lucidity. In the second place he places scholasticism *en rapport* with modern forms of thought and expression. This excellent feature has been noticed as characterizing the preceding volume on “Logic and Ontology.” It is, if anything, more apparent in the treatment of cosmology and psychology in the volume before us. It may safely be said that it is the only work of its class that brings the philosophy of the schools conveyed through a Latin medium into so full a relationship with the pertinent literature in English. For these two reasons especially the work merits the attention of all who have an interest in philosophy.

THE DEVOTION TO THE SACRED HEART OF JESUS. Intended specially for priests and candidates for the priesthood. By *Rev. H. Noldin, S. J.* Authorized and translated from the German. Revised by the Rev. W. H. Kent, O. S. C. 12mo., pp. 272. New York: Benziger Brothers.

Father Noldin tells us that he has written this book out of the abundance of his own heart, and that is certainly the best recommendation that a book of devotion can have. It is a hard task, indeed, to beget devotion in others which we do not feel ourselves. But if we have devotion, and if the mouth speaks out of the abundance of the heart, then the words, whether written or spoken, should bear fruit a hundred fold. The author says:

“Ever since I was placed by my superiors at the head of the theological seminary at Innsbrück it has been my firm persuasion that the blessing of God which rests upon it is proportioned to and goes hand in hand with the zeal wherewith the devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus is promoted and practised in that institute. And with no less certitude have I told myself that the candidate for priesthood who knows and practises this devotion will assuredly acquire the sacerdotal spirit and the virtues proper to a priest in preparation for receiving holy orders, and that it will also furnish

him with a sure means of maintaining and preserving the spirit of his sacred calling unto his life's end.

"It has, therefore, been my constant endeavor to make the alumni committed to my charge acquainted with the devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, to inspire them with love for it and to keep their ardor for a devotion so rich in graces alive and in active operation. All that I have recommended to them and earnestly impressed upon them with this object I have collected and arranged as a whole in the book now laid before the reader. The end proposed in its compilation will be fully attained should this little book conduce in any degree to awaken, to foster, to promote among those for whom it is intended more especially a devotion fraught with such abundant blessings."

The book is intended primarily for priests and ecclesiastical students, and therefore should do most good, for from them the devotion will spread to the people.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW IN THE UNITED STATES. By *Emiliu McOlain, L. L. D.*, Justice of the Supreme Court of Iowa. 12mo., pp. xxxviii.—438. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

In preparation of a book intended to give to non-professional students an intelligent conception of the constitutional law of the United States, both State and Federal, it is essential that the historical development of those institutions and ideas of government which have become characteristic features of our system be noticed, that the practical organization of the government as provided for be explained and that the interpretation which has been put upon the provisions of constitutional instruments in the solution of difficult and important questions which have arisen shall be stated; and it is especially important that the proper relationship between these various divisions of the subject shall be maintained.

This book is not, on the one hand, a theoretical exposition of the general principles of government, nor on the other a mere description of the workings of the State and Federal Governments and their various departments. But, as its title imports, so far as accomplishment corresponds to the purpose, it is an exposition of the principles of an established system; and it is intended to afford to the reader an explanation of the important events of the history of our government, and means of intelligently comprehending the problems constantly arising, the solution of which will make our constitutional history of the future. In short, if the book serves its purpose it will enable the person who intelligently uses it to reach

a rational and correct conception of the nature and meaning of the Constitutions of the United States and of his State, and to understand the essential features of the governments provided for by such Constitutions.

The main divisions of the book are: Part I., "System of Government;" Part II., "Organization of Government;" Part III., "Legislation;" Part IV., "Executive Power;" Part V., "The Judiciary;" Part VI., "The States and Territories;" Part VII., "Relations of the Individual to the Government;" Part VIII., "Civil Rights."

LETTERS OF BLESSED JOHN OF AVILA. Translated and selected from the Spanish by the *Benedictines of Stanbrook*. With preface by the Right Rev. Abbot Gasquet, O. S. B. 12mo., pp. 168. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

This little volume contains the translation from the Spanish of a few spiritual letters of Blessed John of Avila. The author is probably not much known to English readers; certainly he is not as well known as he deserves to be both for his own merits as a writer and because in his own time, the sixteenth century, and even beyond the limits of his own country, Spain, he was a man of great renown. He was recognized everywhere as a special servant of God and as a true director of all souls desiring to walk the higher paths of perfection, or of those who needed help and encouragement to serve God in the humbler walks of life. He was also a preacher of exceptional power. St. Francis of Sales, in his "Practice of the Love of God," speaks of him as "the learned and saintly preacher of Andalusia," St. Francis Borgia as "the great master," and he was popularly known as the "Apostle of Andalusia" from the wonderful change which his preaching wrought in that district of Spain. His discourses were likened to "fishermen's nets gathering in fishes of all sorts" whenever and wheresoever he cast them, so plentiful was the harvest of souls which followed his exposition of the Christian teaching.

The letters begin with one to St. Teresa, discussing her account of her spiritual life, and followed by twenty-four addressed to others in various stations of life and standing in need of spiritual direction or consolation. They all indicate the deeply spiritual man with that keen insight into men's souls which only the holiest servants of God possess.

THE LEGAL TENDER PROBLEM. By *Percy Kinnaird*, of the Nashville Bar. 12mo., pp. 335. Chicago: Ainsworth & Co.

The economic, social and political life of man is determined by the method of procedure adopted by the Government for the pro-

duction of commodities and by the method of procedure adopted for the distribution or dispersal of the surplus commodities among the people. The method of procedure of commodities is very easily arranged, and the arrangement is simplified by allowing every one to choose any profession or follow any pursuit that his taste, inclination and means may prompt.

This liberty of action may be termed Individualism, Industrial Freedom or Liberalism, and is the generally accepted method in all civilized countries. While theoretically this is true, it is evident that equality of right and opportunity is not secured to the individual in practice. The cause which operates to withhold equality of right and opportunity in practice from the many, in both the creation and exchange of products, notwithstanding they may have said equality in theory, may be found in the method of procedure adopted for the distribution or exchange of products. Hence the "Legal Tender Problem," which Mr. Kinnaid treats in this volume at great length, and evidently intends to continue on some future occasion, for we notice the announcement at the close that this is the end of Volume I.

We respectfully suggest to the publishers that something should be said in the introduction about the extent of the work, because the purchaser may easily be led to think that it is complete in one volume.

THE SACRED HYMNS (Gl' Inni Sacri) AND THE NAPOLEONIC ODE (Il Cinque Maggio) OF ALEXANDER MANZONI. Translated in English rhyme, with portrait, biographical preface, historical introductions, critical notes and appendix containing the Italian texts, by *Rev. Joel Foote Bingham, D. D., L. H. D.* Crown, 8vo., cloth, gilt top, \$3.00 net. New York: Oxford University Press.

The universal admiration of the literary world for Alexander Manzoni, whom it looks up to as a star in the galaxy of Italian letters second in brilliancy to Dante Alighieri only, will go out to this rendering in English of his "Sacred Hymns and the Napoleonic Ode." A well-known critic has said of Manzoni:

"Great as a poet, equally great as a prose writer, in thought, in feeling, in a sculpturesque style, he marked out deeply a new path in every kind of literature, historical, critical, philosophical, philological. His lyric poetry, his tragedies (in which he initiated reforms which are to-day the hinge of the modern drama) and the wonderful romance, 'I Promessi Sposi,' are monuments from which issue beams of light that penetrate every mind and every heart."

The translator says:

"In the succeeding translations I have aimed at the following

points: First of all and above all, to give the exact sense of the author down to the finest shade of meaning, to the utmost degree that lay in my power in the use of our tongue. The number of verses in the several stanzas, though a matter, I suppose, of no great importance, is in fact the same as in the original or varies from it but seldom."

HISTORICAL SKETCHES OF THE PHILADELPHIA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF ST. CHARLES BORROMEO. 1832-1905. By *Rev. A. J. Schulte*. 8vo., pp. 125. Illustrated. Overbrook: St. Charles' Seminary.

For a long time there has been an urgent demand for a second edition of Father Schulte's excellent "Historical Sketch of St. Charles' Seminary," and for two reasons: because it was out of print, and because of the valuable information which it contains and which cannot be found anywhere else without much labor.

St. Charles' Seminary has led such a peaceful life that only those who have been connected with it realize the important place which it occupies in the history of the Church in this country. Modesty is a characteristic of Philadelphia, and the Catholic Church of Philadelphia shows this characteristic in an eminent degree. If we were more boastful the history of our Seminary would be written on a thousand pages instead of a hundred. But we are proud of the hundred in a lawful way, for the lists of presidents, rectors, professors and alumni are long and honorable.

These tables are invaluable, and the future historian will bless the memory of the humble author who faithfully compiled them without claiming the small reward of a place for his name on the title page. Though brief, the sketch is complete and interesting. The illustrations are well chosen and well executed. Not only the graduates of St. Charles' Seminary, but all students of history should have the book and preserve it.

GESCHICHTE DER WELTLITERATUR. Von *Alexander Baumgartner, S. J.* Band V. Die französische Literatur. Herder: Freiburg and St. Louis. Price, \$4.25, net.

In a beautiful volume of over seven hundred pages Father Baumgartner surveys the wide field of French literature from its earliest beginnings to the present day. It was natural to begin the history of recent literature with the French, as their language and literature was the first in order of time to develop among the modern nations of Europe and long dominated the others. That Father Baumgartner has done the work well it is useless to say to those who

have studied the four preceding tomes. He has divided the work into three books. In the first he traces the development of French language and literature during the Middle Ages. The second deals with the golden days of the French classics in the seventeenth century and the subsequent decay during the period of the temporary triumph of infidelity. The third book treats of French literary efforts during the nineteenth century. As the learned author wastes no time with irrelevant or platitudinous generalizations and philosophizings, the usual bane of such writings, he is enabled to give a satisfactory and always true and judicious appreciation of each of the prominent French writers, and in consequence the work is equally instructive and entertaining. We look forward with interest to the succeeding volumes.

THE FEASTS OF MOTHER CHURCH, With Hints and Helps for Holier Keeping of Them. By *Mother M. Salome*, St. Mary's Convent, The Bar, York. 12mo., pp. 269.

"In the Catholic Church is a garden enclosed and flowing with delights. Color and fragrance pulsate perennially behind the encircling wall; freshness and life stream upwards unceasingly from the glowing beds. It is a 'feast-garden,' and holy days are its flowers.

"Alas! through running after the unsatisfying excitements provided in the world's garden many Catholics would seem to have lost the key to this one and its heart-stirring treasures. The lost key will be found in these plain, direct and chatty papers. We anticipate that Mother M. Salome's 'Hints and Helps' will shed life and fragrance on the daily life of many a Catholic. Her book is a praiseworthy attempt to revive a taste for those powerful yet too often neglected aids to practical and joyous religion, the 'Feasts of Mother Church.'"

The book is made up of a collection of meditations or reflections on the feasts without any pretense to learning or exhaustiveness. It will serve best the humble, pious soul who accepts help in any form with gratitude.

PASTORAL MEDICINE. A Hand-book for the Catholic Clergy. By *Alexander E. Sanford, M. D.* 12mo., pp. 234. New York: Joseph L. Wagner.

"The purpose of 'Pastoral Medicine' is to present to the practical theologian facts of physical science, as developed by the medical profession, for the purpose of applying them in pastoral functions and in explanation and support of the teachings of faith and morals.

'Pastoral Medicine' has for its object the treatment of some branches of the scope of pastoral labors, which, as a rule, are but sparingly, if at all, included in the clerical student's plan of studies."

The author writes clearly and covers a very large field in comparatively small space. We fear that some critics will say that proper judgment was not used in dividing this space. For instance, sixty-four pages are given to "Hygiene" and only a little over three pages to "Procuratio Abortus," while "Craniotomy" is not noticed at all. And yet within a week the writer of this notice has seen a petition signed by all the Catholic students of a large medical school, and addressed to an ecclesiastical superior, complaining that they cannot get unity of direction from their confessors on these subjects, and asking for the authoritative teaching of the Church. These and kindred subjects which stand midway between theology and medicine and which effect both body and soul are the questions that are burning. If some one will answer them in brief form, but accurately, so that a copy of the answers can be placed in the hands of every Catholic medical student and physician in the country he will become a public benefactor.

ACTA INEDITA HISTORIARUM PONTIFICUM ROMANORUM PRAESENTIM SAEC.
XV., XVI., XVII., Illustrantia. Edidit *Ludovicus Pastor*. Vol. I.: 1376-
1464. Sumptibus Herder. Price, \$2.85.

With this volume Dr. Pastor begins to redeem a promise made eighteen years ago, namely, to collect and publish the numerous documents relating to the Popes of the Renaissance and Reformation periods still lurking in the various archives of Italy, as an appendix to his valuable "History of the Popes." It is a publication quite indispensable to those who wish to control the statements of historical writers by a reference to the original founts of information. We rejoice to see it stated in the public press that the long-awaited fourth volume of Pastor's Popes will be issued during the course of the present year. We have often regretted that the time of this great historian should have been spent on other tasks. Surely his "History of the Popes" is the all-sufficient work of a single life. To this monumental labor he ought to have consecrated his undivided energies.

PRAYERS AND MEDITATIONS ON THE LIFE OF CHRIST. By *Thomas Haemerken*
& *Kempta*. Translated from the text of edition of Michael Joseph Pohl
by W. Duthoit, D. C. St. Louis: B. Herder. Price, \$1.35.

This is a very acceptable addition to our devotional literature. A practical experience of some months has convinced us that the

"Meditations" of the pious author of the "Imitation" are not only an excellent book for one's private devotions, but that they are also wonderfully appropriate for readings to the faithful after the morning's Mass. This is particularly true of the meditations on Our Lord's Passion, which may be read on the mornings of Lent with great profit to the people. They are concise and pithy, and present à Kempis at his best. We may remark, by the way, that Dr. Pohl's beautiful edition of the opera omnia of Thomas à Kempis has now reached its sixth and penultimate volume.

THE LITTLE FLOWERS OF ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI. With eight illustrations. By *Paul Woodroffe*. 12mo., pp. viii.—277. London: Kegan Paul, etc.

This edition of the Fioretti is based by permission upon the translation issued by the Franciscan Fathers at Upton, which has been for some time out of print. It has been carefully revised by Mr. Thomas Okey, and when necessary has been brought into closer accordance with the Italian, care having been taken to preserve as much as possible the simplicity of the original. The present publishers are enabled to avail themselves of so scholarly a rendering by the courtesy of the Catholic Truth Society, under whose auspices it first appeared. The compiler of the Fioretti is unknown, but the work is supposed to date from the middle of the fourteenth century.

DIE PARABELN DES HERRN IM EVANGELIUM exegetisch und praktisch erläutert. Von *Leopold Fonck, S. J.* Zweite, vielfach verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage. Innsbruck and New York: Pustet.

The first edition of Professor Fonck's "Parables of Our Lord" was exhausted immediately upon the appearance of the work, the best proof of its excellence. The improvements introduced into the second edition are not very important, so little did it stand in need of revision. We recommend the book most warmly to students, and especially to preachers of the Divine Word. Since the bulk of Our Saviour's message was delivered to the multitudes in parables, it is clearly the duty of His ministers to penetrate their meaning; and this is by no means an easy task.

STUDIES IN RELIGION AND LITERATURE. By *William Samuel Lilly*. St. Louis: B. Herder. Price, \$3.25, net.

Under this vague caption Mr. Lilly has gathered together nine essays published at different times and in various periodicals. They

are miscellaneous in character, but all, like everything which proceeds from this author's veteran pen, extremely interesting and instructive. No Catholic writer in the English literary world can compare with Mr. Lilly in the influence which he exerts upon the thinking non-Catholic public, and although we cannot always agree with him in his estimate of men and events, yet we feel throughout his writings the spirit of one who is a sincere Catholic at heart and who is actuated by the highest and purest motives.

PSALLITE SAPIENTER. Erklärung der Psalmen im Geiste des betrachtenden Gebets und der Liturgie. Von *Dr. Maurus Wolter, O. S. B.* Frelburg and St. Louis: B. Herder. Price, \$2.75, net.

It speaks volumes for the intelligent piety of the clergy and educated laity of Germany that this noble work on the Psalms has reached a third edition. It is just the book one needs for the interpretation of this difficult portion of Sacred Scripture. It is, first of all, the life-work of a very saintly monk, the outpouring of a heart filled with love of God. The ascetical so predominates throughout one forgets at first to observe the vast amount of accurate critical erudition which it contains. The priest who reads his psalter day by day will discover unthought of wealth of meaning in the Psalms of his Divine Office.

SKETCHES FOR SERMONS, chiefly on the Gospels, for the Sundays and holy days of the year. By *Rev. R. K. Wakeham, S. S.*, St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, N. Y. 8vo., pp. 229. New York: Joseph L. Wagner.

Had the writing of the "Sketches or Suggestions for Sermons for the Sundays and Holy Days of the Year" depended upon the author's own initiative, or upon his belief that he could fill a want long felt, they would surely never have appeared in print. It was in response to a special request that the task was undertaken; and it may be truly affirmed that neither the desire to oblige nor any prospect of personal advantage resulting from the work would have been a sufficient inducement to accede to the request, had the writer not indulged the hope that he might be able to render a real service to his busy brother priests, at least to those just entering the field of their missionary labors and assuming the great responsibility of "preaching the Word."

OFFICIUM HEBDOMADAE MAIORIS, a Dominica in Palmis usque ad Sabbatum in albis, iuxta Ordinem Brevionii, Missalis et Pontificalis Romani editum. 12mo., pp. 420. Neo Eboraci: Fr. Pustet.

This is a most attractive edition of the Office for the two weeks

beginning with Palm Sunday and ending with Low Sunday, and including the Masses for the whole period. It resembles in size and general make-up the smaller Votive Office Book, with type like the larger one. A special feature is an appendix containing the Ordo of the Mass and commemorations of the feasts which occur during the period covered by the book, so that with this book in hand a priest is equipped for the two weeks without necessity for any references. It is the most attractive and convenient Holy Week for priests that we have seen, and it is sure to meet with popular favor.

LATEST PUBLICATIONS OF GINN & CO., BOSTON, NEW YORK, CHICAGO AND LONDON:

A SHORT HISTORY OF ENGLAND. By *Edward P. Ohney*. 12mo., cloth, pp. 625. Illustrated. List price, \$1.35; mailing price, \$1.40.

This "Short History of England" is about midway in length between the shorter school histories and the longer works which are of value chiefly to advanced students or as books of reference. It is admirably adapted for use in colleges and in high schools that offer a rather complete course in English history. A great many persons and a great many events often included in text-books have been omitted in order that those which are more significant can be given enough space and attention to show their real character and importance. For the same reason less attention has been given to military than to civil history. For instance, the space given to the Wars of the Roses has been reduced as much as possible in order to give sufficient emphasis to the Reformation.

The book has been illustrated with about one hundred and fifty original pen drawings of contemporary objects by competent artists. Bibliographical references to primary and secondary sources are given at the close of each chapter.

The book is written in an easy pleasant style and is most attractively made, but it is not written from a Catholic point of view, although the author seems to be without prejudice.

STORM'S IN ST. JÜRGEN. Edited, with introduction, notes, vocabulary and English exercises, by *J. H. Beckmann*, Teacher of German in the Lincoln (Neb.) High School. International Modern Language Series. 16mo., semi-flexible cloth. Portrait. List price, 35 cents; mailing price, 40 cents.

Theodore Storm's chief claim upon posterity undoubtedly rests in the simple lyric poems which are filled with the atmosphere and charm of his North German home. But in the tender realism of "In St. Jürgen" even more than in the haunting melancholy of his

"Immensee" is to be found a truth and beauty too near to real life ever to be passed by unnoticed. Certain of Storm's shorter stories are veiled with romantic sentiment, but the fresh and out-of-door environment of "In St. Jürgen" is like a breath from one of his beloved northern moors.

In this new volume in the International Modern Language Series is presented an excellent lesson of how environment influences human life. The tone of the story is sweet, although somewhat sad and melancholy, and cannot fail to hold the pupil's interest from beginning to end. The notes of the book are limited to proper explanations and are brief and to the point. There are included a number of exercises for retranslation which it is hoped will prove a useful addition to the text. The book is well adapted for use in the second year of the high school or in first year college classes.

LA MERE DE LA MARQUISE and LA FILLE DU CHANOINE. By *Edmond About*. International Modern Language Series. Edited, with notes and vocabulary, by O. B. Super, Professor of Romance Languages in Dickinson College. 16mo., semi-flexible cloth, 227 pages, with frontispiece. List price, 50 cents; mailing price, 55 cents.

Few French writers of fiction are more widely known than Edmond About, and none more richly deserves popularity. His writings contain a humor which makes them entertaining reading, and a skill in the delineation of character inferior only to that of the great Balzac. They are particularly noteworthy on account of the absence of those features which make much French fiction inappropriate for use in the class room. The style is not difficult, and the notes and vocabulary are of such fulness that the book may be used during the first year's work by any excepting very young students. For these it will be more suitable if used in the second year. Even mature students, however, will find it useful and interesting for rapid reading.

FLACHSMANN ALS ERZIEHER. By *Otto Ernst*. International Modern Language Series. Edited, with introduction and notes, by Elizabeth Kingsbury, Teacher of German in Lincoln Academy, Lincoln, Neb. 16mo., semi-flexible cloth, 190 pages. Portrait. List price, 40 cents; mailing price, 45 cents.

This popular German comedy, which has reached its fifteenth thousand in Germany, gives a true view of the German public school system of to-day. The style is that of the modern realistic school, though entirely free from objectionable features. The atmosphere of modern Germany pervades the play. The language is conversational throughout and offers the student excellent drill in idioms

of everyday speech. The notes are copious enough to elucidate historical, biographical, provincial and idiomatic expressions, as well as the more difficult points in grammar. A brief account of the author's life precedes the text. The book may be used to best advantage in the second or third year of the study of German.

SOME SUCCESSFUL AMERICANS. By *Sherman Williams*, New York State Institute Conductor, and formerly Superintendent of Schools at Glens Falls, N. Y. 12mo., cloth, 194 pages. Illustrated. List price, 50 cents; mailing price, 55 cents.

This book is intended for supplementary reading in the sixth, seventh and eighth grades. It contains sketches of the lives of many famous Americans who achieved success in the face of what are generally called adverse conditions. Abraham Lincoln, Louisa Alcott, Cornelius Vanderbilt, Mary Lyon, Peter Cooper and Horace Greeley are among those taken as examples. Both men and women are included and they have been chosen so as to represent different callings and various sections of the country and thus interest the largest number of pupils.

ZSCHOKKE, DER ZERBROCHENE KRUG. Edited, with introduction, notes and vocabulary, by *Herbert Charles Sanborn*, Head Instructor in German in the Bancroft School, Worcester, Mass. 16mo., semi-flexible cloth, xvi.+76 pages, with frontispiece. List price, 25 cents; mailing price, 30 cents.

This popular little story, so characteristic of the narrative style of its author, is peculiarly well adapted, on account of the simplicity of its style and diction, for classes of beginners in German. The present edition has accordingly been carefully prepared to meet the needs of this grade of readers. The story itself has always been a favorite with young people, and its interest is enhanced by flashes of that pure humor in which Zschokke excelled.

ELEMENTS OF BOTANY, with Key and Flora. Revised Edition. By *Joseph Y. Bergen*, formerly Instructor in Biology, English High School, Boston. Cloth, 12mo., 283+257 pages. Illustrated. List price, \$1.30; mailing price, \$1.45.

Bergen's "Elements of Botany," revised edition, is designed to furnish a half-year course in the subject for students in secondary schools. It covers all the ground which ordinary classes can traverse in the time indicated, and endeavors to present only those topics which are essential to an elementary course in the science.

It differs from the earlier editions of the "Elements" mainly in the greater stress laid on the topics of œcology and cryptogamic botany, in the somewhat abbreviated directions for histological work on seed plants, and in the greatly improved quality of the illustrations. Minor changes will be found on almost every page.

DIE JOURNALISTEN. By *Gustav Freytag*. Edited, with brief biographical introduction, notes and complete vocabulary, by Leigh R. Gregor, Lecturer on Modern Languages in McGill University, Montreal, Canada. International Modern Language Series. 16mo., semi-flexible cloth, 231 pages. Portrait. List price, 45 cents; mailing price, 50 cents.

"Die Journalisten" is the best comedy which Germany has produced since "Minna von Barnhelm," and is recommended by the Committee of Twelve as "suitable reading matter for the third year." It gives a picture of German political and social life about 1850, which in the main is applicable to the Germany of to-day. In Mr. Gregor's edition there is commentary of the usual sort, and the annotations also include descriptions of usages and characteristic national features alluded to in the play.

ELEMENTARY WOODWORKING. By *Edwin W. Foster*, Instructor in Shopwork and Drawing in the Manual Training High School, Brooklyn, N. Y.; graduate of the Sloyd Seminary, Nääs, Sweden; formerly Supervisor of Manual Training, Utica, N. Y. 12mo., cloth, 133 pages. Illustrated. List price, 75 cents; mailing price, 80 cents.

This book is especially designed to meet modern conditions. It is to be placed in the hands of the student to reinforce the oral instruction and demonstration in the higher grammar grades and in the first years of the high school. The work is divided into two parts. The book is profusely illustrated with pictures and diagrams showing the proper use of tools and the action of their various parts.

THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA.

English-speaking Catholics the world over will hail with delight the news that a great Catholic encyclopedia in the English language is soon to become an actuality. The publication of such a work has long been talked about. Its needs and advantages are an old story long discussed and long wished for. It has at last got beyond that stage and is about to become a realization. Arrangements have now been completed in New York city for that purpose, its board of

editors formed and a publishing company established and incorporated to undertake it.

The board of editors of the Catholic Encyclopedia consists of: Charles George Herbermann, Ph. D., LL. D., professor of the Latin language in the College of the City of New York, editor-in-chief; Edward Aloysius Pace, Ph. D., D. D., professor of philosophy in the Catholic University of America; Conde Benoist Pallen, Ph. D., LL. D., managing editor; Thomas Joseph Shahan, J. U. L., D. D., professor of church history in the Catholic University of America; John J. Wynne, S. J., editor of the *Messenger*.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- THE LIGHT OF FAITH.** A Defense, in Brief, of Fundamental Truths. By *Frank McGloin*. St. Louis: Herder. Price, \$1.00 net.
- WITHIN AND WITHOUT THE CHURCH.** By *Rev. J. Lasenatre*. Adapted from the French by Rev. J. M. Leleu. St. Louis: B. Herder. Price, 30 cents.
- JESUS CHRIST THE WORD INCARNATE.** Considerations gathered from the works of the Angelic Doctor, St. Thomas Aquinas. By *Roger Freddi, S. J.* Translated from the Italian by F. J. Sullivan, S. J. Published by B. Herder, St. Louis. Price, \$1.25, net.
- GENESIS UND KEILSCHRIFTFORSCHUNG.** Ein Beitrag zum Verstaendnis der biblischen Ur- und Patriarchengeschichte. Von *Dr. Johannes Nikel*. Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. Price, \$1.75, net.
- DIE MODERNE BIOLOGIE UND DIE ENTWICKLUNGSTHEORIE.** Von *Erich Wassermann, S. J.* Zweite vermehrte Auflage. Herder: Freiburg and St. Louis. Price, \$1.75, net.
- THE LIFE AND TIMES OF CARDINAL WISEMAN.** By *Wilfrid Ward*. 2 vols., 8vo., pp. 579 and 656. New edition at reduced price without change of text. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.
- THE STORY OF THE CONGO FREE STATE.** Social, political and economic aspect of the Belgian system of government in Central Africa. By *Henry Wellington Wack, F. R. G. S.* (member of New York Bar). With 125 illustrations and maps. 8vo., pp. xv.—634. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.
- THE GENTLE SHAKESPEARE.** A Vindication. By *John Pym Yeatman*, of Lincoln's Inn, Esquire, etc.; Honorary Member of the Shakespeare Society of New York, etc. Third edition (augmented). Large 8vo., pp. 406. New York: The Shakespeare Press. Birmingham: Moody Brothers.
- SERMONS PREACHED IN ST. EDMUND'S COLLEGE CHAPEL ON VARIOUS OCCASIONS.** With an introduction by the Most Rev. Francis Bourne, Archbishop of Westminster. Collected and arranged by Edwin Burton, Vice President. 12mo., pp. 249. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- SOCIALISM AND CHRISTIANITY.** By the *Right Rev. William Stang, D. D.*, Bishop of Fall River. 12mo., pp. 207. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- THE CHURCH OF GOD ON TRIAL BEFORE THE TRIBUNAL OF REASON.** By *Edward J. Maginnis*, of the Schuylkill County Bar, Pa. 12mo., pp. 248. New York: Christian Press Association.
- THE SAINTS.** ST. PETER FOURIER. By *L. Pingand*. Translated by C. W. W. 12mo., pp. 194. London: Duckworth & Co. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- THE LIFE OF ST. PATRICK, APOSTLE OF IRELAND.** By *William Canon Fleming*, Rector of St. Mary's, Moorfields, London. 12mo., pp. 178. New York: Benziger Brothers.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXX.—JULY, 1905—No. 119.

ENCYCLICAL OF HIS HOLINESS POPE PIUS X. ON THE TEACHING OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE.

SANCTISSIMI DOMINI NOSTRI PII DIVINA PROVIDENTIA PAPAE X.
LITTERAE ENCYCLICAE AD SACROS UNIVERSI CATHOLICI ORBIS
ANTISTITES DE CHRISTIANA DOCTRINA TRADENDA VENERA-
BILIBUS FRATRIBUS PATRIARCHIS PRIMATIBUS ARCHIEPIS-
COPIS EPISCOPIS ALIISQUE LOCORUM ORDINARIIS CUM APOS-
TOLICA SEDE PACEM ET COMMUNIONEM HABENTIBUS.

PIUS PP. X.

Venerabiles Fratres, Salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem.

A CERBO nimis ac difficili tempore ad supremi pastoris munus, in universum Christi gregem gerendum, arcanum Dei consilium tenuitatem Nostram evexit. Inimicus namque homo sic gregem ipsum iam du obambulat vaferrimaque insidiatur astutia, ut nunc vel maxime illud factum esse videatur, quod senioribus Ecclesiae Ephesi praenuntiabat Apostolus: "Ego scio quoniam intrabunt . . . lupi rapaces in vos, non parcentes gregi." (Acts xx., 29.) Cuius quidem religiosae rei inclinationis, quicumque adhuc divinae gloriae studio feruntur, causas rationesque inquirunt; quas dum alii alias afferunt, diversas, pro sua quisque sententia, ad Dei regnum in hisce terris tutandum restituendumque sequuntur vias. Nobis Venerabiles Fratres, quamvis cetera non respuamus,

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1905, by P. J. Ryan, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

iis maxime assentiendum videtur, quorum iudicio et praesens animorum remissio ac veluti imbecillitas, quaeque inde gravissima oriuntur mala, ex divinarum ignorance rerum praecipue sunt repetenda. Congruit id plane cum eo, quod Deus ipse per Oseam prophetam dixit: “. . . Et non est scientia Dei in terra. Maledictum, et mendacium, et homicidium, et furtum, et adulterium iundaverunt, et sanguis sanguinem tetigit. Propter hoc lugebit terra, et infirmabitur omnis, qui habitat in ea.” (Os. iv., I, ss.)

Et re quidem vera, aetate hac nostra esse quamplurimos in christiano populo, qui in summa ignorance eorum versentur, quae ad salutem aeternam nosse oportet, communes, eaeque pro dolor! non iniustae, sunt quaerimoniae. Quum vero christianum dicimus populum, non plebem tantum aut sequioris coetus homines significamus, qui saepenumero aliquam ignorantiae excusationem ex eo admittunt, quod immitium dominorum imperio cum pareant, vix sibi suisque temporibus servire queunt: sed illos etiam et maxime, qui etsi ingenio cultuque non carent, profana quidem eruditione affatim pollent, ad religionem tamen quod attinet, temere omnino atque imprudenter vivunt. Difficile dictu est quam crassis hi saepe tenebris obvolvantur; quodque magis dolendum est, in iis tranquille iacent! De summo rerum omnium auctore ac moderatore Deo, de christianae fidei sapientia nulla fere ipsis cogitatio. Hinc vero nec de Verbi Dei incarnatione, nec de perfecta ab ipso humani generis restauratione quidquam norunt; nihil de Gratia, quae potissimum est adiumentum ad aeternorum adeptionem, nihil de Sacrificio augusto aut de Sacramentis, quibus gratiam ipsam assequimur ac retinemus. Peccato autem quid nequitiae insit quid turpitudinis nullo pacto aestimatur; unde nec eius vitandi nec deponendi sollicitudo ulla sicque ad supremum usque diem venit, ut sacerdos, ne spes absit salutis, extrema agentium animam momenta, quae fovendae maxime caritati in Deum impendi oporteret, edocendo summatim religionem tribuat: si tamen, quod fere usuvenit, usque adeo culpabili ignorantia moriens non laboret ut et sacerdotis operam supervacaneam arbitretur et, minime placato Deo, tremendum aeternitatis viam securo animo ingrediendam putet. Unde merito scripsit Benedictus XIV. decessor Noster: “Illud affirmamus, magnam eorum partem, qui aeternis suppliciis damnantur, eam calamitatem perpetuo subire ob ignorantiam mysteriorum fidei, quae scire et credere necessario debent, ut inter electos cooptentur.” (Instit. xxvi., 18.)

Haec quum ita sint, Venerabiles Fratres, quid quaeso mirabimur, si tanta sit modo inque dies augescat, non inter barbaras iniquas nationes, sed in ipsis gentibus quae christiano nomine feruntur, corruptela morum et consuetudinum depravatio? Paulus quidem

apostolus ad Ephesios scribens haec edicebat: "Fornicatio autem, et omnis immunditia, aut avaritia, nec nominetur in vobis, sicut decet sanctos; aut turpitudine, aut stultiloquium." (Ephes. v., 3 s.) At vero sanctimoniae huic ac pudori cupiditatum moderatori divinarum rerum sapientiae fundamentum posuit: "Videte itaque, fratres, quomodo caute ambuletis: non quasi insipientes, sed ut sapientes. . . . Propterea nolite fieri imprudentes, sed intelligentes quae sit voluntas Dei." (Ephes. v., 15 ss.)

Et plane id merito. Voluntas namque hominis inditum ab ipso auctore Deo honesti rectique amorem, quo in bonum non adumbratum sed sincerum veluti rapiebatur, vix retinet adhuc. Currup telâ primaevae labis depravata, ac Dei factoris sui quasi oblita, eo affectum omnem convertit ut diligat vanitatem et quaerat mendacium. Erranti igitur pravisque obcaecatae cupiditatibus voluntati duce opus est qui monstret viam, ut male desertas repeat iustitiae semitas. Dux autem, non aliunde quesitus, sed a natura comparatus, mens ipsa est: quae si germana careat luce, divinarum nempe rerum notitia, illu habebitur, quod coecus coeco ducatum praestabit et ambo in foveam cadent. Sanctus rex David, quum Deum de veritatis indidisset: "Signatum est," aiebat, "super nos lumen vultus tui, Domine." (Ps. iv., 7.) Quid porro ex hac largitione luminis sequatur addidit, inquiens: "Dedisti laetitiam in corde meo;" laetitiam videlicet, qua dilatatum cor nostrum, viam mandatorum divinorum currat.

Quod revera ita esse facile consideranti patet. Deum namque eiusque infinitas quas perfectiones nominamus, longe exploratius, quam naturae vires scrutentur, christiana nobis sapientia manifestat. Quid porro? Iubet haec simul summum ipsum Deum officio "fidei" nos revereri, quae mentis est; "spei" quae voluntatis; "caritatis" quae cordis: sicque totum hominem supremo illi Auctori ac Moderatori mancipat. Similiter una est Iesu Christi doctrina, quae germanam praestabilemque hominis aperit dignitatem, quippe qui sit filius Patris caelestis qui in caelis est, ad imaginem eius factus cumque eo aeternum beateque victurus. At vero ex hac ipsa dignitate eiusdemque notitiâ infert Christus debere homines se amare invicem ut fratres, vitam heic degere, ut lucis filios decet, "non in commensationibus, et ebrietatibus; non in cubilibus et impudiciis; non in contentione, et aemulatione" (Rom. xiii., 13); iubet pariter omnem sollicitudinem nostram proiicere in Deum, quoniam ipsi cura est de nobis; iubet tribuere egenis, benefacere iis qui nos oderunt, aeternas animi utilitates fluxis huius temporis bonis antepondere. Ne autem omnia singulatim attingamus, nonne ex Christi institutione homini superbius audenti demissio animi, quae verae gloriae origo est, suadetur ac praecipitur? "Quicumque . . .

humiliaverit se . . . hic est maior in regno caelorum." (Matth. xviii., 4.) Ex ea prudentiam spiritus docemur, qua prudentiam carnis caveamus; iustitiam, qua ius tribuamus cuique suum; fortitudinem, qua parati simus omnia perpeti, erectoque animo pro Deo sempiternaque beatitade patiamur; temperantiam denique, qua vel pauperiem pro regno Dei adamemus, quin et in ipsa cruce gloriemur, confusione contempta. Stat igitur, ab christiana sapientia, non modo intellectum nostram mutuari lumen, quo veritatem assequatur sed voluntatem etiam ardorem concipere, quo evehamur in Deum cumque Eo virtutis exercitatione iungamur.

Longe equidem absumus ut ex his asseramus, pravitatem animi corruptionemque morum non posse cum religionis scientia coniungi. Utinam non id plus nimio probarent facta! Contendimus tamen, ubi crassae ignorantiae tenebris sit mens circumfusa, nullatenus posse aut rectam voluntatem esse aut mores bonos. Apertis namque oculis si quis incedat, poterit ille sane de recto tutoque itinere declinare: qui tamen caecitate laborat, huic periculum certe quidem imminet. Adde porri: corruptionem morum, si fidei lumen penitus non sit extinctum, spem, lumen penitus non sit extinctum, spem lumen penitus non sit extinctum, spem facere emendationis; quod si utrumque iungitur et morum pravitas et fidei ob ignorantiam defectio, vix erit medicinae locus, patetque ad ruinam via.

Quum igitur ex ignorantia religionis tam multa tamque gravia deriventur damna; alia vero ex parte, quum tanta sit religiosae institutionis necessitas atque utilitas, frustra enim christiani hominis officia impleturus speratur qui illa ignoret: iam ulterius inquirendum venit, cuius demum sit perniciosissimam hanc ignorantiam cavere mentibus, adeoque necessaria scientia animos imbuere. Quae res, Venerabiles Fratres, nullam habet dubitationem gravissimum namque id munus ad omnes pertinet, quotquot sunt animarum pastores. Hi sane, ex Christi praecepto, creditas sibi oves agnoscere tenentur ac pascere; pascere autem hoc primum est, docere; "Dabo vobis," sic nempe Deus per Ieremiam promittebat, "pastores juxta cor meum, et pascunt vos scientiâ et doctrina." (Ier. iii., 15.) Unde et Apostolus Paulus aiebat: "Non . . . misit me Christus baptizare, sed evangelizare" (I. Cor. i., 17), indicans videlicet primas eorum partes, qui regendae aliquo modo Ecclesiae sunt positi, esse in instituendis ad sacra fidelibus.

Cuius quidem institutionis laudes persequi supervacaneum ducimus, quantique ea sit apud Deum ostendere. Certe miseratio quam pauperibus ad levandas angustias tribuimus, magnam a Deo habet laudem. At longe maiorem quis neget habere studium et laborem, quo, non fluxas corporibus utilitates, sed aeternas animis docendo monendoque conciliamus? Nihil profecto optatius, nihil gratius

queat Iesu Christo animarum servatori accidere, qui de se per Isaiam professus est: "Evangelizare pauperibus misit me." (Luc. iv., 18.)

Hic tamen praestat, Venerabiles Fratres, hoc unum consecrari atque urgere, nullo sacerdotem quemlibet graviori officio teneri, nullo arctiori nexu obligari. Etenim in sacerdote ad vitae sanctimoniam debere scientiam adiici, quis neget? "Labia . . . sacerdotis custodient scientiam." (Malach. ii., 7.) Atque illam reapse severissime Ecclesia requirit in iis qui sint sacerdotio initiandi. Quorsum id vero? Quia scilicet ab eis divinae legis notitiam christiana plebs expectat, illosque ad eam impertiendam destinat Deus: "Et legem requirent ex ore eius: quia angelus Domini exercituum est." (Malach. ii., 7.) Quamobrem Episcopus, in sacra initiatione, sacerdotii candidatos alloquens: "Sit," inquit, "doctrina vestra spiritualis medicina populo Dei; sint providi cooperatores ordinis nostri; ut in lege sua die ac nocte meditantes, quod legerint credant, quod crediderint doceant." (Pontif. Rom.)

Quod si nemo sacerdos, ad quem haec non pertineant, quid porro de illis censebimus, qui, nomine ac potestate curionum aucti, animarum rectoris munere, vi dignitatis et quodam quasi pacto inito, funguntur? Hi quodammodo pastoribus et doctoribus sunt accensendi, quos dedit Christus ut fideles iam non sint parvuli fluctuantes, et circumferantur omni vento doctrinae in nequitia hominum; veritatem autem facientes in caritate, crescant in illo per omnia, qui est caput Christus. (Ephes. iv., 14-15.)

Quapropter sacrosancta Tridentina Synodus, de animarum pastoribus agens, officium eorum hoc primum et maximum esse edicit, christianam plebem docere. (Sess. v., cap. 2 de ref.; Sess. xxii., cap 8; Sess. xxiv., cap. 4 et 7 de ref.) Hinc iubet illos, dominicis saltem diebus festisque sollemnioribus, de religione ad populum dicere, sacri vero Adventus tempore et Quadragesimae quotidie, vel saltem ter in hebdomada. Neque id modo: addit namque teneri parochos, eisdem saltem dominicis festisque diebus, per se vel per alios, in fidei veritatibus erudire pueros, eosque ad obedientiam in Deum ac parentes instituere. Quum vero sacramenta fuerint administranda, praecipit, ut qui sunt suscepturi, de eorumdem vi, facili vulgarique sermone, doceantur.

Quas sacrosanctae Synodi praescriptiones Benedictus XIX. decessor Noster, in sua Constitutione "Etsi minime," sic brevi complexus est ac distinctius definivit: "Duo potissimum onera a Tridentina Synodo curatoribus animarum sunt imposita: alterum, ut festis diebus de rebus divinis sermones ad populum habeant; alterum, ut pueros et rudiores quosque divinae legis fideique rudimentis informant." Iure autem sapientissimus Pontifex duplex hoc officium distinguit, sermonis videlicet habendi, quem vulgo Evangelii

explicationem vocitant, et christianae doctrinae tradendae. Non enim fortasse desint qui, minuendi laboris cupidi, persuadeant sibi homiliam pro catechesi esse posse. Quod quam putetur perperam, consideranti patet. Qui enim sermo de sacro Evangelio habetur ad eos instituitur, quos fidei elementis imbutos iam esse oportet. Panem diceret, qui adultis frangatur. Catechetica e contra institutio lac illud est, quod Petrus Apostolus concupisci sine dolo a fidelibus volebat, quasi a modo genitis infantibus. Hoc scilicet catechistae munus est, veritatem aliquam tractandam suscipere vel ad fidem vel ad christianos mores pertinentem, eamque omni ex parte illustrare: quoniam vero emendatio vitae finis docendi esse debet, oportet catechistam comparisonem instituere ea inter quae Deus agenda praecipit quaeque homines reapse agunt; post haec, exemplis opportune usum, quae vel e Scripturis sacris, vel ex Ecclesiastica historia, vel e sanctorum virorum vita sapineter hauserit, suadere auditores eisque, intento veluti digito, commonstrate quo pacto componant mores; finem denique hortando facere, ut qui adstant horreant vitia ac declinent, virtutem sectentur.

Scimus equidem eiusmodi tradendae christianae doctrina munus haud paucis invidiosum esse, quod minoris vulgo aestimetur nec forte ad popularem laudem captandam aptum. Nos tamen hoc esse iudicium eorum censemus, qui levitate magis quam veritate ducuntur. Oratores profecto Sacros, qui, sincero divinae gloriae studio, vel vindicandae tuendaeque fidei, vel Sanctorum laudationibus dent operam, probandos esse non recusamus. Verum illorum labor laborem alium praevium desiderat, scilicet catechistarum; qui si deest, fundamenta desunt, atque in vanum laborant qui aedificant domum. Nimium saepe orationes ornatissimae, quae confertissimae concionis plausu excipiuntur, hoc unum assequuntur ut pruriant auribus; animos nullatenus movent. E contra catechetica institutio humilis quamvis et simplex, verbum, illud est, de quo Deus ipse testatur pm Isaïam: "Quomodo descendit imber, et nix de caelo, et illuc ultra non revertitur, sed inebriat terram, et infundit eam, et germinare eam facit, et dat semen serenti, et panem comedenti: sic erit verbum meum quod egredietur de ore meo: non revertetur ad me vacuum, sed faciet quaecumque voluit, et prosperabitur in his, ad quae misi illud." (Is. lv., 10-11.) Similiter arbitrandum putamus de sacerdotibus, iis, qui, ad religionis veritates illustrandas, libros operosos conscribunt; digni plane quae ideo commendatione multa exornentur. Quotus tamen quisque est, qui eiusmodi volumina verset, fructumque inde hauriat auctorum labori atque optatis respondentem? Traditio autem christianae doctrinae, si rite fiat, utilitatem audientibus nunquam non affert.

Etenim (quod ad inflammandum studium ministrorum Dei iterum

advertisse iuverit) ingens modo eorum est numerus atque in dies augetur, qui de religione omnino ignorant, vel eam tantum de Deo christianeque fidei notitiam habent, quae illos permittat, in media luce catholicae veritatis, idololatrarum more vivere. Quam multi eheu! sunt, non pueros dicimus, sed adulta, quin etiam devexa aetate, qui praecipua fidei mysteria nesciant prorsus; qui Christi nomine audito, respondeant: "Quis est, . . . ut credam in eum?" (Ioan. ix., 36.) Hinc odia in alios struere ac nutrire, pacationes conflare iniquissimas, inhonestas negotiorum procuraciones gerere, aliena gravi foenore occupare, aliaque id genus flagitiosa haud sibi vitio ducunt. Hinc Christi legem ignorantes, quae non modo turpia damnat facinora, sed vel ea cogitare scienter atque optare; etsi forte, qualibet demum de causa, obscoenis voluptatibus fere abstinere, inquinatissimas tamen cogitationes, nulla sibi religione iniecta, suscipiunt; iniquitates super capillos capitis multiplicantes. Haec porro, iterasse iuvat, non in agris solum vel inter miseram plebeculam occurrunt, verum etiam ac forte frequentius inter homines amplioris ordinis, atque adeo apud illos quos inflat scientia, qui vana freti eruditione religionem ridere posse autumant et "quaecumque quidem ignorant, blasphemant." (Iud. x.)

Iam, si frustra seges e terra speratur quae semen non exceperit, qui demum bene moratas progenies expectes, si non tempore fuerint christiana doctrina institutae? Ex quo colligimus iure, quum fides id aetatis usque eo languerit ut in multis pene sint intermortua, sacrae catechesis tradendae officium vel negligentius persolvi, vel praetermitti omnino. Perperam enim ad habendam excusationem quis dixerit, esse fidem gratuito munere donatam nobis atque in sacro baptismo cuique inditam. Equidem utique quotquot in Christo baptizati sumus fidei habitu augemur; sed divinissimum hoc semen non "ascendit . . . et facit ramos magnos" (Marc. iv., 32) permissum sibi ac veluti virtute insita. Est et in homine, ab exortu, intelligendi vis: ea tamen materno indiget verbo, quo quasi excitata in actum, ut aiunt, exeat. Haud aliter christiano homini accidit, qui, renascens ex aqua et Spiritu Sancto, conceptam secum affert fidem; eget tamen Ecclesiae institutione, ut ea ali augerique possit fructumque ferre. Idcirco Apostolus scribebat: "Fides ex auditu, auditus autem per verbum Christi" (Rom. x., 17); institutionis autem necessitudinem ut ostenderet, addit: "Quomodo . . . audient sine praedicante?" (Rom. xiv.)

Quod si, ex huc usque explicatis, religiosa populi eruditio quanti momenti maxime esse oportet, ut Doctrinae sasit ostenditur, curae Nobis quam quod crae praeceptio, qua, ut Benedicti XIV. decessoris Nostri verbis utamur, ad Dei gloriam et ad animarum salutem nihil utilius est institutum (Constit. "Etsi minime," 13) vigeat semper aut,

sicubi negligitur, restituatur. Volentes igitur, Venerabiles Fratres, huic gravissimo supremi apostolatus officio satisfacere, atque unum paremque morem in re tanta ubique esse; suprema Nostra auctoritate, quae sequuntur, in dioecesibus uniaersis, observanda et exequenda constituimus districteque mandamus.

I. Parochi universi, ac generatim quotquot animarum curam gerunt, diebus dominicis ac festis per annum, nullo excepto, per integrum horae spatium, pueros et puellas de iis, quae quisque credere agereque debeant ad salutem adipiscendam, ex catechismi libello erudiant.

II. Iidem, statis anni temporibus pueros ac puellas ad Sacramenta Poenitentiae et Confirmationis rite suscipienda praeparent, continenti per dies plures institutione.

III. Item, ac peculiari omnino studio, feriis omnibus Quadragesimae atque aliis, si opus erit, diebus post festa Paschalia, aptis praeceptionibus et hortationibus adoloscentulos et adoloscentulas sic instruant, ut sancte primum de altari libent.

IV. In omnibus et singulis paroeciis consociatio canonice instituat, cui vulgo nomen Congregatio Doctrinae christianae. Eâ parochi, praesertim ubi sacerdotum numerus sit exiguus, adiutores in catechesi tradenda laicos habebunt, qui se huic dedent magisterio tum studio gloriae Dei, tum ad sacras lucrandas indulgentias, quas Romani Pontifices largissime tribuerunt.

V. Maioribus in urbibus, inque iis praecipue ubi universitates studiorum, lycea, gymnasia patent, scholae religionis fundentur ad erudiendam fidei veritatibus vitaeque christianae institutis iuventam, quae publicas scholas celebrat, ubi religiosae rei mentio nulla iniicitur.

VI. Quoniam vero, hac praesertim tempestate, grandior aetas non secus ac puerilis religiosa eget institutione; parochi universi ceterique animarum curam gerentes, praeter consuetam homiliam de Evangelio, quae festis diebus omnibus in parochiali Sacro est habenda, eâ horâ quam opportuniorem duxerint ad populi frequentiam, illâ tantum exceptâ qua pueri erudiuntur, catechesim ad fideles instituant, facili quidem sermone et ad captum accommodato. Qua in re Catechisma Tridentino utentur, eo utique ordine ut quadriennii vel quinquennii spatio totam materiam pertractent quae de Symbolo est, de Sacramentis, de Decalogo, de Oratione et de praeceptis Ecclesiae.

Haec Nos quidem, Venerabiles Fratres, auctoritate apostolica constituimus et iubemus. Vestrum modo erit efficere ut, in vestra cuiusque dioecesi, nullâ morâ atque integre executioni mandentur; vigilare porro et pro auctoritate vestra cavere, ne quae praecipimus oblivioni dentur, vel, quod idem est, remisse oscitanterque im-

pleantur. Quod ut reapse vitetur, illud assidue commendetis et urgeatis oportet, ut parochi ne imparati catechesis praeceptiones habeant, sed diligenti prius adhibita praeparatione; ut ne loquantur humanae sapientiae verba, sed, "in simplicitate cordis et sinceritate Dei," (II. Cor. i., 12), Christi exemplum sectentur, qui quamvis "abscondita" eructaret "a constitutione mundi" (Matth. xiii., 35), loquebatur tamen omnia "in parabolis ad turbas et sine parabolis non loquebatur eis." (Matth. xiii., 34.) Id ipsum et Apostolos, a Domino institutos, praestitisse novimus; de quibus Gregorius Magnus aiebat: "Curaverunt summopere rudibus populis plana, et capabilia non summa atque ardua praedicare." (Moral. I. xvii., cap. 26.) Ad religionem autem quod attinet, homines magnam partem radibus, hac tempestate nostra sunt accensendi.

Nolimus porro, ne ex eiusmodi simplicitatis studio persuadeat quis sibi, in hoc genere tractando, nullo labore nullaue meditatione opus esse: quin immo maiorem plane, quam quodvis genus aliud, requirit. Facilius longe est reperire oratorem, qui copiose dicat ac splendide, quam catechistam qui praeceptionem habeat omni ex parte laudabilem. Quamcumque igitur facilitatem cogitandi et eloquendi quis a natura sit nactus, hoc probe teneat, nunquam se de christiana doctrina ad pueros vel ad populum cum animi fructu esse dicturum, nisi multa commentatione paratum atque expeditum. Falluntur sane qui plebis imperitia ac tarditate fisi, hac in re negligentius agere se posse autumant. E contrario, quo quis rudiores nactus sit auditores, eo maiore studio ad diligentia utatur oportet, ut sublimissimas veritates, adeo a vulgari intelligentia remotas, ad obtusorem imperitorum aciem accommodent, quibus aequae ac sapientibus, ad aeternam beatitatem adipiscendam sunt necessariae.

Iam igitur, Venerabiles Fratres, Mosis verbis, in hac postrema litterarum Nostrarum parte, liceat vos alloqui: "Si quis est Domini, iungatur mihi." (Exod. xxxii., 26.) Advertite, rogamus quaesumusque, quanta animarum clades ex una divinarum rerum ignorantia veniat. Multa forte utilia planque laudatione digna, in vestra cuiusque dioecesi, sunt a vobis instituta in commissi gregis commodum: velitis tamen, prae omnibus, quanta potestis contentione, quanto studio, quanta potestis contentione, quanto studio, quanta assiduitate hoc curare atque urgere, ut doctrinae christianae notitia cunctorum pervadat animos penitusque imbuat. "Unusquisque," Petri Apostoli utimur verbis, "sicut accepit gratiam, in alterutrum illam administrantes, sicut boni dispensatores multiformis gratiae Dei." (I. Petr. iv., 10.)

Diligentiam industriasque vestras, beatissima Virgine immaculata intercedente, fortunet vobis Apostolica benedictio, quam, testem

caritatis Nostrae ac caelestium gratiarum auspicem, vobis et clero ac populo cuique credito amantissime impertimus.

Datum Romae, apud Sanctum Petrum die XV. Aprilis MDCCCVC., Pontificatus Nostri anno secundo.

PIUS PP. X.

THE TEACHING OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE.

ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF PIUS X., BY DIVINE PROVIDENCE POPE,
TO THE SACRED BISHOPS OF THE UNIVERSAL CHURCH ON
THE TEACHING OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE.

TO HIS VENERABLE BROTHERS, THE PATRIARCHS, PRIMATES,
ARCHBISHOPS, BISHOPS AND OTHER ORDINARIES HAVING
PEACE AND UNION WITH THE APOSTOLIC SEE, PIUS P. P. X.
SENDS GREETING AND BENEDICTION.

Venerable Brothers:

IN THIS extremely distressing and difficult time the hidden designs of God have imposed on our slender strength the office of Supreme Pastor over the universal flock of Christ. The hardship is great because the enemy has long been prowling around the flock and with subtle cunning has endeavored to bring havoc upon it, succeeding to such an extent that more than ever what the Apostle wrote to the ancients of the Church of Ephesus seems to be realized: "I know that ravening wolves will enter among you, not sparing the flock." (Acts xx., 29.)

Those among us who are prompted by zeal for the glory of God and who seek for the reasons of the present decay of religion ascribe it to various causes, and each, according to his own views, adopts different methods in the endeavor to protect and restore the kingdom of God on earth. To us, Venerable Brethren, without rejecting the opinions of others, it seems we must agree with the judgment of those who attribute the remissness, or rather the intellectual debility of our times—a condition from which such grave evils arise—chiefly to ignorance of divine things. There seems in our days to be a recurrence of what God said by the mouth of the Prophet Osee: "There is no knowledge of God in the land. Cursing and lying and killing and theft have overflowed and blood hath touched blood. Therefore shall the land mourn, and every one that dwelleth in it shall languish." (Osee iv., 1.)

In fact, in our age it is a common and alas! not an unjust complaint that there are a great many Christian people who are in the densest ignorance about what concerns their eternal salvation. Nor when we say Christian people do we refer to the humbler classes, who often may find an excuse for their ignorance in the fact that the hard rule of their harsh masters does not leave them the opportunity to attend to themselves or permit the disposal of their time; but we speak especially of those who are not lacking in intellectual culture, nay, who are often notably conspicuous for knowledge in profane science, but who in religious matters pass their lives in thoughtlessness and unconcern. It is difficult to explain in what dense darkness they are involved, and, what is worse, in what heedlessness they live. Of God, the Supreme Ruler and Author of all things, of the teaching of Christianity they have never a thought. They know nothing of the Incarnation; nothing of God's perfect renovation of the human race; nothing of grace, which is especially required for the attainment of things eternal; nothing of the august Sacrifice of the Mass, or of the sacraments by which we acquire and retain divine grace. Of the wickedness and foulness of sin they have no appreciation, and hence no care to avoid or to withdraw from it; and they arrive at the portals of death in such a condition that the priest, not to dispel all hope of salvation, is compelled to sum up and teach the very elements of religious truth, instead of devoting those last moments to fostering sentiments of love of God in the soul. Often it is not even that, and, as too frequently happens, the dying man in his reprehensible ignorance regards the ministrations of the priest as unnecessary, and persuades himself that he can enter on the dreadful road of eternity with a tranquil mind and face the anger of God, whom he has not thought it necessary to propitiate. Fittingly has it been said by our predecessor, Benedict XIV.: "We declare that the greater part of those who are damned have brought the calamity on themselves by ignorance of the mysteries of the faith, which they should have known and believed, in order to be united with the elect."

Hence, Venerable Brothers, why should we wonder that not only among savage peoples, but even in those nations which are still spoken of as Christian, there should be such a widespread and ever-increasing corruption of morals and depravity of life? The Apostle Paul, writing to the Ephesians, said: "Fornication, and all uncleanness and covetousness, let it not be so much as named among you, as becomes saints; or obscenity or foolish talking." (Eph. cv., 3.)

Now, the foundation of this holiness and purity of soul, which are to hold evil desires in check, is, as the Apostle declared, the

knowledge of divine things: "See, therefore, brethren, how you walk circumspectly, not as unwise, but as wise. Therefore become not unwise, but understanding what is the will of God." (Eph. cv., 15.)

And rightly so. For the will of man now scarcely retains even that love of right and justice which was implanted in the human heart by the Almighty Creator, and which was intended to lead to what is the true good, and not to what is only a shadow. Depraved by the primal fault and forgetful of God, its Maker, it directs everything to the cultivation of vanity and the pursuit of falsehood. Blinded by wicked desires, there is surely need of a guide to lead it in the ways of justice which have been unfortunately abandoned.

Of course the natural guide is the human mind, but if the mind has not its proper light, viz.: the knowledge of divine things, it will be the blind leading the blind, ending only in the ditch. The holy King David, praising God for the light of truth with which He had illumined the intellect, exclaimed: "The light of Thy countenance, O Lord, is signed upon us." And he signified what was to follow upon the possession of this gift of light when he added: "Thou hast given gladness in my heart" (Ps. iv., 7); to wit, that gladness with which the heart is dilated when it runs in the ways of God's commandments.

Whosoever considers this will perceive how true it is that Christian truth, more perfectly than the mere powers of nature, shows us the nature of God and His infinite perfections.

Why should it not be so? Christian truth bids us revere Almighty God by faith, which is an act of the mind; by hope, which is an act of the will; by charity, which is an act of the heart, and thus it subjects the whole man to its Supreme Author and Ruler. In the same way the doctrine of Jesus Christ unfolds for us the true nobility of human nature, inasmuch as it reveals man as the son of the Heavenly Father, after whose likeness he is made, and holds out to him an eternal and glorious reward. But from this very dignity with which man is invested and from the knowledge of it, Christ wishes us to learn that we should love one another and live as behooves the sons of light, "not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chamberings and impurities, not in contention and envy." (Rom. xiii., 13.)

He likewise enjoins upon us to cast all our care upon God, knowing that He will provide for us. He bids us give to the poor, to do good to those who hate us, to place the eternal advantage of our soul above the fleeting pleasures of this world. And, not to speak of all these things in detail, does not the teaching of Christ appeal to and command the proud to cultivate that humility of

soul which is the origin of true glory? "Whoever, therefore, shall humble himself he is the greater in the kingdom of heaven." (Matth. xvii., 4.) It teaches us that prudence of the spirit which wards off the prudence of the flesh; that justice which gives each his own; that fortitude which makes us ready to bear all things, and with resolute heart to suffer for God and our eternal happiness. Finally it teaches that temperance by which we even love poverty for the sake of the kingdom of God, nay, by which we "glory in the cross of Christ, despising the shame." Hence it follows that not only does Christian teaching illumine the mind and enable it to attain the truth, but it inflames the will and enkindles that ardor which makes us aspire to God and unite ourselves with Him by the exercise of every virtue.

It is not our purpose to assert that depravity of the heart is inconsistent with knowledge of religious truth. Would that facts did not prove the contrary! But we say that where the mind is enveloped in the dark clouds of ignorance, there cannot be either rectitude or morality. For although a man with eyes open can turn away from the right path, the blind man is constantly in danger of going wrong. Moreover, whereas if the light of faith is not wholly extinct, there is always a hope of reformation; depravity of morals, united with ignorance of the truth, leaves scarcely any remedy and leaves the road open that leads to ruin.

Since therefore so many and such serious evils result from ignorance, and since, on the other hand, there is such need of and such helpfulness in religious instruction, it is in vain for any one to hope to fulfill his duty unless he knows what that duty is. Upon whom the task devolves to do away with this fatal ignorance and to impart to men's minds the knowledge which it is so necessary to possess, let us now stop to consider.

On whom it devolves, Venerable Brothers, admits of no doubt; for this most important duty regards all who are charged with the care of souls. They are bound by the precept of Christ to know and feed the flock intrusted to them. But to feed is, first of all, to teach: "I will give you"—thus God promised by Jeremias—"pastors according to my own heart, and they shall feed you with knowledge and doctrine." (Jerem. iii., 15.) Wherefore Paul the Apostle said, "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel" (Cor. i., 17), indicating that the first duty of those who in any degree are set over the government of the Church is the instruction of the faithful in sacred things.

We deem it superfluous to dwell at greater length in praising such instruction, or showing its value in the eyes of God. No doubt the pity we manifest in relieving the wants of the poor is most accept-

able to God; but who will question that the care and labor by which we procure, not transient benefits for the body, but eternal for souls by teaching and warning them, are far more acceptable. Nothing, certainly, can be more desirable, nothing more pleasing to Jesus Christ, the Redeemer of immortal souls, who said of Himself by Isaias, "He hath sent me to preach the Gospel to the poor." (St. Luke iv., 18.)

It is important, Venerable Brothers, to emphasize and urge this in a particular manner, that no weightier duty is appointed unto priests, and by no stricter obligations are they bound. In a priest holiness of life must be accompanied by knowledge: "The lips of the priest shall keep knowledge" (Mal. ii., 7); and the Church strongly insists upon it for those who are about to enter the sacred ministry. Wherefore does she so insist? Because the Christian people expect from them the knowledge of the Divine law, and God chooses them to impart it: "They shall seek the law at his mouth; because he is the Angel of the Lord of hosts." (Mal. ii., 7.) On this account the Bishop at ordination thus addresses the candidates for the priesthood: "Let your doctrine be the spiritual medicine of the people of God; let them be provident helpers of our order; that, meditating upon the law day and night, they may believe what they read, and teach what they have believed." (Pontif Rom.) If these words apply to all priests, what must be the thought of those who, having official rank and power, are charged with the government of souls by virtue of their priestly dignity and, as it were by a sacred contract! They are the pastors and doctors whom Christ hath given that the faithful be no longer children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine by the wickedness of men; but by doing the truth in charity, they may in all things grow up in Him who is the Head, even Christ. (Ephes. iv., 14-15.)

Wherefore the holy Council of Trent, considering the pastors of souls, declared that their first and chief duty was to teach the faithful of Christ. Hence it commands them to explain the truths of religion to the people at least on Sundays and more solemn festivals, and every day, or certainly three times a week, in the sacred seasons of Advent and Lent. Nor is this all, for it adds that parish priests are bound, at least on these same Sundays and festivals, either personally or by others, to instruct the children in the truths of faith, and to train them in obedience to God and their parents. When, moreover, the sacraments are to be administered, it orders that those who are to receive them be instructed in plain and simple language regarding their effects.

These prescriptions of the holy Synod Benedict XIV., our predecessor, thus summarized and defined more distinctly in his Con-

stitution *Etsi minime*: "Two duties particularly are imposed by the Council of Trent on the guardians of souls: one, that they should speak to the people about Divine things on festival days; the other that they should instruct children and all less intelligent persons in the rudiments of faith and of the Divine Law." Rightly, indeed, does the prudent Pontiff distinguish the twofold office: of delivering an address—which is usually called an explanation of the Gospel—and of teaching Christian doctrine. For there may not be wanting some who, for the sake of lessening labor, may persuade themselves that the homily may take the place of catechism—a mistake evident to all who reflect. The sermon on the Gospel is addressed to those who have been already imbued with the elements of the faith. It may be called the bread distributed to grown people. Catechetical teaching, on the contrary, is the milk which the Apostle Peter wished the people to desire without guile. That is to say, the office of the catechist consists in taking up for explanation a truth pertaining to faith or morals, and making it clear from every point of view. And since the purpose of teaching should be amendment of life, the catechist must institute a comparison between what God commands to be done and what men do in point of fact; then, making timely use of examples drawn from the Sacred Scriptures, ecclesiastical history, or the lives of the saints, he must persuade his hearers, and point out to them clearly how they are to set their conduct in order; finally, let him exhort all present to abhor and fly vice and to pursue a virtuous life.

We understand, indeed, that such a duty as this of teaching Christian doctrine is unattractive to not a few as not being generally held in high estimation, nor perhaps likely to attract popular praise. But for our part, we consider that such an opinion is founded rather on thoughtlessness than truth. Sacred orators, who, from a sincere desire of glorifying God, justify and defend the faith, or proclaim the glories of the saints, are certainly to be praised. But this work supposes a preceding one; that, namely, of the catechist; which, if it has been omitted, the foundations on which to build the house have not been laid. Too often do the most ornate discourses, which receive the loud applause of crowded assemblages, serve only to tickle men's ears, without at all moving their hearts. Catechetical instruction, on the other hand, although unpretentious and simple, is that word to which God Himself witnesseth by Isaias: "As the rain and the snow come down from heaven and return no more thither, but soak the earth and water it, and make it to spring and give seed to the sower and bread to the eater; so shall my word be, which shall go forth from my mouth: it shall not return to me void, but it shall do whatsoever I please, and shall

prosper in the things for which I sent it." (Isa. lv., 10-11.) A like opinion should we form of those priests who laboriously write books in defense of the truths of religion: They are certainly worthy of much praise. But how many persons will study these volumes and draw profit from them commensurate with the author's labor and desires? Whereas, the explanation of Christian doctrine, if it be duly given, is never fruitless for the hearers.

It will further inflame the zeal of the ministers of God to recall the enormous and constantly increasing number of persons who either know nothing at all of religion, or who have only such a knowledge of God and of the Christian faith that, in the midst of the light of Catholic truth, they lead the lives of idolaters. How many, alas! there are, not children merely, but adults, who, even at an advanced age, are entirely unacquainted with the principal mysteries of the faith; who, when they hear the name of Christ, ask "Who is He that I may believe in Him?" (St. John ix., 36.) Hence it is that they foment hatred between men; they form criminal associations; they engage in dishonest business; they usuriously seize the property of others, and consider these and similar things no crime. Hence, ignoring the law of Christ, which condemns not only unclean deeds, but thoughts also and desires, although refraining perhaps, for one reason or another, from obscene pleasures, they reject no sinful thought. There being no religion in their hearts, their sins are multiplied beyond the hairs of their heads. These things, in truth, it is well to remember, occur not merely among the rude and wretched, but also, and perhaps more frequently, among persons of loftier station, and amongst those whom science inflates, who, in the conceit of vain learning, deem religion a thing to be laughed at and "blaspheme whatever things they know not." (St. Jude i., 10.)

Now if a harvest is vainly expected from ground which has received no seed, how shall we look for good morals in a generation which has not received Christian instruction? Wherefore, we justly conclude that since faith has so languished that in many persons it seems to be dying, the duty of catechetical instruction must have been negligently performed or altogether omitted. It is but a false excuse to pretend that faith is a gratuitous gift conferred on each one in baptism. All who are baptized in Christ do indeed receive the habit of faith; but this divinest seed does not "grow up and shoot out great branches" (St. Mark iv., 32) by its own innate power. As there is in man from birth the faculty of understanding, which needs the mother's promptings to develop into efficiency, so it does not happen otherwise to the Christian, who, born anew of water and the Holy Ghost, is imbued with faith.

He needs Christian formation, that faith may be fostered and may increase and bear fruit. Hence the Apostle wrote: "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of Christ." (Rom. x., 17.) But that he might show the necessity of teaching, he added, "How shall they hear without a preacher?"

If therefore, from all that has been hitherto said, it is clear of what importance is the religious training of the people, it should be our greatest concern that the teaching of Christian doctrine, than which, to use the words of our predecessor, Benedict XIV., nothing more useful has been instituted, should always be vigorously maintained, and where it has fallen into disuse restored.

Therefore, Venerable Brothers, wishing to satisfy the weighty obligations of our high and apostolic office, and desiring to see uniformity of custom everywhere established in so important a matter, we do decree and strictly command that in all dioceses throughout the world the following regulations be observed and enforced:

I. All parish priests, and in general all to whom the care of souls is committed, must teach the catechism to their young boys and girls for the space of one hour on all Sundays and holy days of the year without exception; explaining to them what each is bound to believe and practise in order to attain eternal salvation.

II. They shall also at stated times in the year carefully prepare these children for the Sacraments of Penance and Confirmation by courses of instruction extending through many days.

III. Likewise, by means of appropriate instructions and exhortations, given every day during the Lenten season, and if necessary also after Easter, they shall, but with very particular care and diligence, prepare their young people of both sexes for a worthy reception of their first Holy Communion.

IV. Let there be canonically established in every parish the association commonly known as the Society of Christian Doctrine, by means of which, especially where the number of priests is small, pastors may secure lay help in the teaching of catechism; and these lay teachers should apply themselves to their task out of zeal for the glory of God, as well as from a desire to gain the rich indulgences lavishly granted by the Roman Pontiffs.

V. In the larger cities, especially where there are public academies, colleges and universities, let religious doctrine classes be established for the purpose of teaching the truths of our faith and the precepts of Christian morality to the youths who attend such public institutions wherein no mention whatsoever is made of religion.

VI. And since, in our times especially, those more advanced in years stand in no less need of religious instruction than do the

young, all pastors and others having the care of souls shall, on Sundays and holy days, and at an hour most convenient for the majority of the faithful, instruct them in the catechism, using plain and simple language, adapted to their intelligence. This, moreover, is in addition to the usual homily on the Gospel prescribed for the parish Mass, and the hour chosen should not conflict with that of the children's instruction. The catechism of the Council of Trent should be followed in all these instructions, which ought to be so ordered as to cover in the space of four or five years the entire matter of the Apostles' Creed, the Sacraments, the Ten Commandments, Prayer and the Precepts of the Church.

All this, Venerable Brethren, we determine and decree by our apostolic authority; it will now be your duty, each in his own diocese, to put it into effect immediately and in every detail.

Moreover, it will be incumbent upon you to be vigilant in this matter, using your authority unto the end that what we now enjoin be not overlooked and forgotten, or, what would be as bad, that it be not put into effect negligently and listlessly. Indeed, if you would prevent such a result, you must constantly exhort and urge your pastors not to attempt these catechetical instructions offhand, but rather to prepare for them with the utmost care; for thus they will not discourse in the words of human wisdom, but "in simplicity of heart and the sincerity of God." (II. Cor. i., 12.) Let them take pattern by Christ Himself, who though uttering "things hidden from the foundation of the world" (Matt. xiii., 35), nevertheless declared all things "in parables to the multitudes; and without parables He did not speak to them." (Matt. xiii., 34.) We know, too, that the Apostles who were trained by Our Lord did the same; and St. Gregory the Great used to say that "their greatest care was to preach to the simple people the plainest truths, things not high and lofty, but such as they could easily comprehend." (Moral I., xvii., chapter 26.) And in matters of religion it is no different in our day; most men are to be moved and won by what is most simple and direct.

Now it would be a mistake, and far from our intention, were any one to conclude from what we have said about this striving after simplicity in religious instruction, that such manner of discourse calls for no effort, no thoughtful preparation. On the contrary, it demands much more than any other kind of public speaking. Far easier is it to find an orator who can deliver an elaborate and brilliant sermon than a catechist able to give a simple but flawless instruction. Therefore, however much one may be gifted by nature with ease in composition or fluency of expression, let him nevertheless be persuaded of this—that he will never derive any real

fruit for souls from his instructions on Christian doctrine to children or to the people, unless he has well prepared himself by long and careful study and meditation. It is a grievous mistake to count on the people's ignorance or slowness of comprehension, and use this as an excuse for negligence in the matter of preparation. The fact is, that the less cultured one's audience, the greater care and pains must be taken to bring within the reach of their feebleness comprehension truths the most sublime and far above the reach of the ordinary intelligence—yet truths as necessary to salvation for the ignorant as for the learned.

And now, Venerable Brethren, before closing this letter, we shall address to you the words of Moses: "If any man be on the Lord's side, let him join with me." (Exod. xxxii., 26.) Consider well, we entreat and beseech you, what a loss to souls arises from this one cause, ignorance of the things of God. There may doubtless be many useful and praiseworthy works established in your diocese for the good of the flock entrusted to you, yet it should be your desire and ambition, before all else, to urge this present matter with all possible zeal and insistence, to work for and promote this one great end—that knowledge of Christian doctrine may thoroughly pervade and imbue the minds of all the faithful. In the words of the Apostle St. Peter: "As every man hath received grace, ministering the same one to another, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God." (I. Peter iv., 10.)

And while the Most Blessed and Immaculate Virgin will continually intercede for the success of your earnest and zealous efforts, they shall also be favored by our Apostolic Benediction, which we lovingly impart to yourselves, to your clergy and to the faithful under your care, both as a testimony of our affection and as a pledge of heavenly graces.

PIUS X., Pope.

St. Peter's, Rome, April 15, 1905, in the second year of our Pontificate.

THE SCHILLER CENTENARY: "DON CARLOS."

THIS is the Schiller centenary year, and it is also the tercentenary year of Cervantes. No other two writers have had a greater share in fashioning the modern spirit than these. Cervantes' renowned book secured for the author immortality, while it demolished the grand edifice of knightly chivalry. Spain's glory and magnificence grew out of the ideas embodied in that cult; her decline dates from the day when the first edition of "Don Quixote" was given to the world. This was not the deliberate intention of the gifted author. He was a paragon of chivalry himself, in an unpretentious sort of way. He saw, however, the ludicrous side of things more clearly than the grave Spanish dons of his day appear to have seen them. Many conceits were set down in the old books on chivalry, and many things were done by the devotees of chivalry which to that mirth-loving observer seemed the acme of solemn fooling. It needed only to offset them with the homely wit and the practical philosophy of the ordinary man-at-arms, the knight's body servant, using his privilege of speaking out freely, like the court jesters of an earlier day, to make the world see the anachronism of knightly etiquette at a time when knighthood had outlived its uses in the world's economy. Despite the fact that Cervantes, in the view of a good many people, did a disservice to Spain by lowering her ideals, his memory was publicly honored this year throughout the country as it never was before. Feasting, pageantry illustrative of his characters, oratory and music marked the celebration in Madrid and many other cities. Only the genius of the author was remembered; the effects of his work were forgotten for the hour. The lustre he had shed upon the literature of the country, rich as it was ere he arose, in great writers, was the fact that the whole nation strove to acknowledge with fitting honor; a practical application of the *de mortuis* maxim that few other peoples or individuals have exhibited.

In the case of the Schiller centenary another era of change was celebrated—change of a different order and far wider manifestations. Schiller was the poet and the prophet of the new social ideal. The germ of the modern socialistic philosophy is found in his writings—in his play of "The Robbers" especially. In this play, which was written before the author was eighteen, is found a complete disproof that knowledge of the world and mankind at large, in its various phases and idiosyncrasies, is indispensable to poet, dramatist and novelist. Schiller knew nothing of the world beyond the limits of his little native town of Marbach, in Würtemberg, and nothing of mankind beyond his own household and the obscure

school wherein he derived his elementary learning and his military drill. But reading supplied what experience should have given. He devoted every hour he could snatch from the iron rule of the pedagogue, and gain by strategy, to the study of books. It was an auspicious time for his purpose. German literature was then at its best, before he appeared to give it the finishing glory. He had Klöpstock, Goethe, Müller, Gerstenberg, Lessing and several other great authors, in poetry and drama, to regale himself with. He had beside Wieland's translation of Shakespeare. These he fed on until he was enabled, with the help of a little knowledge of the petty political and social tyranny of which the smaller German States were the theatre at the time—and some of the greater ones, too—to create for himself a world wherein these trammels could find illustration in the actions of individuals and appeal to the instincts of freedom and generosity to work for their amelioration. Thus was "The Robbers" surreptitiously created. It stirred Germany to the core when it was first presented on the stage, for it gave voice to the spirit of discontent then seething in many breasts. It caused the author to be imprisoned for a fortnight by his own local tyrant, the Duke of Würtemberg. He forbade Schiller to write any more plays. But the poet was of a different mind. He made his way stealthily out of his duchy and got into Bauerbach, which was beyond his territory; and there he was free to pursue the study of letters and poetry to his heart's content. One of his first plays written in that retreat held up to the world's scorn the despicable action of that Landgrave of Hesse who sold his subjects to England to fight the American revolutionists, simply that he might have money to spend on his mistresses and his stomach and his stable-boys. This play was called "Cabal and Love." Those who would gain a knowledge of the actual condition of those petty German principalities in Schiller's day will find all they need in that way by turning to the pages of Thackeray. "The Four Georges" gives a lifelike picture of their meanness, their brutality, their beastliness, in the first two books.

These works established Schiller's fame at an age rarely found developing great genius. They were both written before he was of legal age, there is reason to believe. In this respect there is considerable resemblance between some of the greatest poets. Elizabeth Barrett Browning wrote much of her best work at a very early period of girlhood, so did Felicia Hemans. Byron, Moore and Shelley also produced some remarkably fine work in their minority days. Schiller was born in 1759, and his "Robbers" was being played at Mannheim in 1782. He had taken out a degree as M. D. in 1780, but he had written his play three years before he could

succeed in getting it accepted for stage representation. In 1783 he wrote "Cabal and Love," likewise another play called "The Conspiracy of Fiesco." About the same time he resumed the writing of a work begun much earlier, the tragedy of "Don Carlos." This work was founded on an earlier one, a novel, published in Paris by the Abbé Saint Réal in 1672. It is with this work more than with Schiller's own career and general work that this article is concerned. Several other writers have taken the tragic story of Don Carlos for a theme, either for dramatic treatment or otherwise. A modern Spanish writer has used it in a play called "El Haz de Lena" ("The Bundle of Fagots"). The *Messenger* for June very properly administered a rebuke on the subject. The editor remarks: "A writer in the *School Review* tells us that Carlos was 'a degenerate, an oaf devoid of all claims to sympathy, a pitiable being infirm in body and mind and with the most bestial and depraved tastes,' all of which contradicts the popular myth that he was a much abused prince. That is all well enough, and has more or less truth in it; but when the writer explains that this degenerate is expiating the sins of a long line of vicious ancestors, and when we advert to the fact that his vicious ancestors were, first, Philip II., whom even the writer doesn't make out to be anything worse than 'a cold unrelenting but conscientious autocrat,' and then Charles V., and Ferdinand and Isabella, we have an example of how unconscious cerebration may sometimes lead a well intentioned writer to put down what is not in keeping with facts." Now, while it may be true that the unfortunate Crown Prince in question was "a degenerate," in a moral sense, it is only fair to explain that there was a physical reason for that fact, and that none of the writers who have made his story the subject of play or poem seem to have been aware of his real story. It was not until long after Schiller's death that the real facts were brought to light. It was a countryman of Schiller's, Friedrich von Raumer, a nobleman and a man of eminence in the domain of letters as well, who took the trouble to investigate all the documents bearing on the case of Don Carlos, and then had them published for the sake of truth. This was done in the year 1831, under the title "Letters from Paris Illustrative of the History of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries." The work is of the deepest historical interest. Before proceeding to examine the facts it adduces in relation to the life and death of the unhappy Prince, it is proper to glance at the other work performed by Schiller and at the character of the man himself, as presented by those who knew him best—his warm friend, Körner, the poet-soldier who wrote the famous "Song of the Sword," Goethe and others of high standing.

It was in 1786 that Schiller completed "Don Carlos." Next year he went to Weimar, where he became friendly with Herder and Wieland. The German men of letters of that day seem to have been free from the miserable rivalries and jealousies that too often mark literary people in other lands, for in their poems and correspondence are found many noble tributes to those brother workers who strove to elevate the literature of the Fatherland so as to make it voice the swelling aspirations of a great people held in thrall but struggling manfully for emancipation—for such was the case in the Germany of that epoch. Here, in Weimar, Schiller turned from poetry to the more sober Muse of history. He began a great work, "The History of the Revolt of the United Netherlands," and in 1788 this was completed and given to the world. In the year following he was honored by the University of Jena with a professorship in the faculty of philosophy. This appointment did not prevent him from pursuing his favorite art. In the three ensuing years he produced his most important historical work, the "History of the Thirty Years' War," and when this serious task was finished he turned his thoughts to lighter one—odes, essays on Kantian speculation, on æsthetic themes, hymns, amatory verses, ballads and finally his greatest lyrical work, "The Song of the Bell." These finished, the drama once again claimed his attention. In reading for his "Thirty Years' War" he had been forcibly struck with the great figure of Wallenstein, and he selected the character as the central one for the next play he was to write. The result of his study was the "Wallenstein Trilogy," as it is called—a great tragedy embracing three separate but interdependent plays. Swiftly following this operose production came others hardly less so—"Maria Stuart," "The Maid of Orleans," "The Bride of Messina" and "William Tell." "The Maid of Orleans" was of this great group the work that deserves the thanks of the world of truth and justice. Schiller raised the character of the sainted Joan into its proper place. He flung down the gross caricatures of Shakespeare and Voltaire, and placed the figure of the Maid, in all its glory and purity, before the gaze of mankind, in language befitting so sublime a work of justice. His "William Tell" is justly regarded as next to this drama in nobility of style and thought. He had the pleasure of seeing it worthily presented on the Berlin stage before he died. After he completed this play he did little more than collaborate with Göethe (whose friendship he had formed in 1795) in a series of epigrammatic satires called "Xenien," after the thirteenth book of Martial, the Roman satirist.

In 1802 Schiller's fame demanded recognition of the higher powers. He was raised to the rank of the nobility, although he

himself did not covet such a distinction; still for his children's sake he was glad to have it proffered. His parents had been of humble but worthy origin, and both were remarkable for piety and benevolence. His mother was intellectually far above her class and had a special fondness for reading poetical work—hence, perhaps, the son's great gift. She had a strong desire that he should be brought up as a theologian and enter the Church (the Lutheran), but his vocation, he found, did not lie in that direction; neither did it in that of medicine, nor that of the law, to both of which he turned in succession, but in the fascinating field which lures many unfit minds into a morass of disappointment and despair.

Schiller had married, in 1790, when he got his professorship at Jena, his wife being a lady called Charlotte von Lengefeld. He died in 1805—on the 9th of May—the day observed as the centenary. The lady survived him by twenty-one years. They had four children, two sons and two daughters, none of whom exhibited any of his great literary and poetical power. Like Raphael and Mozart, he passed away at an age when genius is at its full flower. His full name was Johann Christoph Friedrich Schiller.

The character of Schiller is of the highest. With all his great gifts he was thoroughly unaffected and honest. He is said to have been a little brusque at times, but men of genius have often shown thus, as when their mental apparatus is busy disturbance or interruption may be resented by even the most amiable. His portraits show us a handsome man, with firmness and judgment indicated in the lines of a finely-cut face, and generosity and pride in the eye and brow.

Schiller had to bear much of the duress of those who have to cultivate the Muses "on a little oatmeal," in his early days. Besides being persecuted by the little tyrants who ruled the German dovecots in his day, he was tried by poverty. Chill penury might have frozen his genius into inutility had he not found friends. Körner was his good angel. Affluence and a noble nature enabled him to befriend a less fortunate brother. He willingly shared his good fortune with one less favorably placed, when the price of the midnight oil was difficult to procure. Few figures among those whose fame Schiller celebrated in his undying verse command more admiration than the gallant young soldier-poet who roused his countrymen to repel foreign aggression and gave his chivalrous life to their service, singing as he fell.

It is rarely found that a great poet can also claim to be called a great historian. Schiller was one of those who possessed a just claim to such a distinction. His historical work is of greater value, in one sense, than his lyrical. He was conscientious, diligent and

sympathetic in his research and depiction of the great events which he undertook to spread before the eyes of mankind for its profit and instruction. The fact that he was a Lutheran, by profession, did not prejudice him when he came to deal with the Catholic side of history. In many passages of his prose writings there is a Catholic strain of thought discernible. This is a peculiarity of German writers of that epoch. Their thoughts were often reminiscent of the source whence their intellect was derived. Like fragments of a beautiful broken vase they spoke of the exquisite material of which they were originally compact and hinted at the grace which the parent form demonstrated in its configuration and embellishment.

Schiller's historical works distinctly exhibit the fact that the wars which ensued on the "Reformation" were political in their origin, for the most part. His horror of the scenes which religious fanaticism created, as the moral pestilence developed in the chief centres of European civilization, is strikingly expressed in many memorable passages. No Catholic historian could write more forcibly than he of the awful doings of the Iconoclasts in Holland. He describes in terms of unqualified horror how they burst into the churches, tore down the images of the Saviour on the cross and of the Virgin and the saints, and battered them into *débris* and how they scattered the Eucharistic wafers about the floor and trampled them under their muddy feet. These chapters of his history are blood-curdling. But, coming from a Protestant, they are useful.

Of what composition were the Iconoclasts? Schiller answers the question in a few graphic sentences. "A frantic band of artisans, boatmen and peasants, mixed with public prostitutes, beggars and thievish vagabonds, about three hundred in number, provided with clubs, axes, hammers, ladders and cords, only few among them furnished with firearms and daggers, cast themselves, inspired with fanatical fury, into the villages and hamlets near St. Omer; burst the gates of such churches and cloisters as they find locked, overthrow the altars, dash to pieces the images of the saints and trample them underfoot. Still more inflamed by this execrable deed, and reinforced by fresh accessions, they press forward straightway to Ypres, where they can count on a strong following of Calvinists. Unopposed they break into the Cathedral; the walls are mounted with ladders, the pictures are beaten into fragments with hammers, the pulpits and pews hewn to pieces with axes, the altars stripped of their ornaments and the sacred vessels stolen." The still more horrible sacrilege above referred to took place in Antwerp Cathedral, almost under the eyes of the Prince of Orange, who found himself powerless to restrain the lawless fury of the forces which

he led. In all his references to this demoniac work Schiller expresses profound abhorrence. In this he presents a pleasing contrast to other Protestant writers—Niebuhr for instance. He, scholar, historian and would-be philosopher, did not shrink from formulating the horrible theory that the Almighty uses the devil as an instrument of His purposes—a notion more blasphemous than even the Hussites' dual theory of good and evil powers. In a letter to his friend Savigny, dated at Bonn, 4th September, 1827, he puts it forward in palliation of the destructive work of the Iconoclasts. He wrote: "You must know there is now springing up in Germany a class who buy great books without intending to read them. For a long time we were too honest to do this, and hence, after the devil, in God's service, had put an end to the convents, which formerly used to buy ponderous works and lay them on their shelves, to lead a useless existence like those monks themselves, works of this magnitude could not be disposed of." The writer of this vile mixture of blasphemy and mendacity was a man of encyclopædic reading, who at one time affected to look down on Schiller, but after his death condescended to say that he had come to regard him more favorably than at first knowledge.

To return to Don Carlos. Schiller did not adopt the theory of degeneracy; the word was not known, in its scientific application, in his day. But his picture of the unhappy prince was drawn from fictitious sources; it was not until Raumer appeared on the scene that the true story of his life was disclosed. In all the long category of odious names there is none more obnoxious in the British ear than that of Philip the Second of Spain, chiefly because he represented the Catholicity that sought to meet the physical force of the Reformation by similar force. Therefore no effort was spared to make him appear a monster of cruelty and unnatural hatred. He has been held accountable for the death of his son by historians who had no opportunity to examine the evidence on the subject, but allowed their religious and political sympathies to take the place of such evidence. Carlos was known to sympathize with the people of the Netherlands, against whom his father was waging war; and this was enough to give a reason for his taking off, as in the case of the Duke of Monmouth and King James, and the similar tragedy of Alexis, the son of the Czar Peter. In the theory of monarchy rebellion against the sovereign, no matter by whom committed, involves the death penalty, how close soever the relationship.

Friedrich von Raumer went to Paris in 1830 for the express purpose of examining the historical documents bearing on this subject and collecting materials for another work on which he was en-

gaged. He was given every facility by the authorities. They threw open the precious archives of the *Bibliothèque du Roi*. Here were stored all the official correspondence relative to the acts of Kings and Queens, at home and abroad, ambassadorial reports of the most confidential character, diplomatic correspondence, and every kind of paper bearing on the subject of the court, the State and the government, from the earliest period that such records began to be kept in France. Such State papers are indispensable to the historian, since they enable him to correct many versions of great events long accepted as the true versions. Raumer was at first bewildered by the mass of materials thus placed at his disposal. But he found it all methodically classified and indexed, and so he had only to select the portion relative to the period with which he was immediately concerned to begin a systematic investigation in chronological and geographical order.

Carlos was the son of King Philip II. and his first wife, the Infanta Maria of Portugal. He was born in the year 1545. He was in infancy a sickly child, and he seems to have had a vicious temper—not by any means an unusual circumstance with boys. Vicious tempers are, in fact, so frequently found in infancy that to set down the possessors as “degenerates” would brand probably half the boys and girls born into the world as degenerates. Temper can be mended by proper care and correction. In a court, however, where it was treason by the law of the land to administer corporal chastisement to the heir to the crown and a substitute had to be provided whenever a whipping was ordered by the guardian, the vicious habit had little chance of mending, but was rather likely to grow worse and develop cruelty as well by the spectacle of another wincing or shrieking under the punishment the real culprit should have got. It was customary in those days to arrange royal marriages at a premature time of life, and so it is found that at the age of thirteen Carlos was provided with a bride of the future in the person of young Elizabeth of Valois, daughter of King Henry II. of France and his consort, Catherine de Medicis. There was nothing formal in this arrangement, as was shown by the marriage of the boy’s father to the very same princess in a little while after the time of the rumored engagement, his third wife, Queen Mary of England, having died. But on these facts the Italian and French romance writers built up a wild tale of boyish love and guilty intrigue, like the story of Hugo and Parisina, and the mysterious death of the prince, a few years afterwards, is attributed to an act of parental vengeance for an unnatural *liaison*. Other writers declare that Carlos took the side of the Dutch when the revolt of the Netherlands set Europe once again in a flame, and for this treason

was done to death. Raumer's investigations disclosed the truth. These versions were purely imaginary, as far as the suggestion of a guilty intrigue with the Queen stepmother was concerned—absolutely ridiculous in their improbability. As regards the sympathy of Carlos for the Flemish insurgents, there may have been a sentiment, but nothing more. The real reason why King Philip found it necessary to put the youth under restraint—friendly restraint, not formal confinement—was his mental condition. He had intermittent fits of insanity, at times becoming dangerous to his watchers. And the cause of this periodical insanity was simple enough. It was not “degeneracy” or hereditary criminality, as the latest theory implies, but the natural result of a very serious accident. Raumer describes it graphically, as he found it told in the State papers. The boy was at the time past his seventeenth year. He was at the University of Alcala, pursuing his studies, along with his kinsmen, Don John or Juan of Austria and the Duke of Parma. He had fallen in love with the pretty daughter of the gardener of a neighboring estate. Stealing out to pay her a visit by an unfrequented way, he fell down a flight of steps somehow and received injuries on the head so serious that his life was for long despaired of. The French Ambassador, St. Sulpice, wrote home that he had to undergo the operation of trepanning. Would not such a circumstance fully account for the after eccentricities of the youth, without the necessity of conjuring up any theory of moral decadence?

Previous to this accident, however, Don Carlos had been in a very poor state of health—so much so that the French Ambassador, Guibert, had, in the previous year, written to Queen Catherine that his condition was hopeless. At that time Catherine designed to form an alliance between her remaining daughter, Margaret, she who subsequently married King Henry of Navarre, and the heir apparent to the throne of Spain. The French and Italian commentators, those hangers-on of the court who acted the part of secret agents for their respective governments, had each personal and national motives for misrepresenting, in different ways, the actions and motives of both King Philip and the Crown Prince. They attributed the latter's misfortunes to his vices. The English mischief-makers did the same thing at the time that Philip's marriage with Queen Mary was the subject of angry controversy. And yet no historian has ever been able to substantiate these tales. Philip was, take him for all and all, a more moral monarch than most other monarchs of his own time or perhaps our own. But he was an uncompromising and combative upholder of the old religion. That fact made him in such eyes appear as a monster.

The measures which the King was obliged to take in order to

restrain the forward inclinations of the unhappy youth seem to have produced in him a sullen and dangerous spirit. There is evidence that he cherished animosity against both his father and his half brother, Don Juan. He may have entered into correspondence with some of the leaders of the revolt in the Low Countries, but of this there is no proof beyond the general assertions of anti-Catholic historians. However, written evidence in such a case should not be looked for, since if any ever existed it must have been destroyed when its message had been delivered to those for whose direction or information it had been sent. The measures which his father was compelled to take, as well as the prevalent gossip at the court, give reason to believe that there was substantial ground for the father's fear that the prince's malady, or passion, whichever it was, had taken the form of secret treason. One of the symptoms of his distemper seems to have been an unbounded credulity. A couple of years after he had sustained the injury to his head a French agent named Hopper is found thus writing to Cardinal Granvelle about his (the prince's) condition: "There is nothing to be made of Don Carlos. He believes all that is said to him; and were he even told that he was dead he would believe it."

In illicit passion the dramatists have found the solution of this waywardness of mind. This is the usual dramatic way. They represent the unfortunate youth as having fallen in love—at the age of thirteen!—with the princess who afterward became his stepmother, and that this passion was reciprocated and continued after their relations had become thus altered. This would account for the King's stern behavior. A jealous suspicion of both wife and son would naturally lead even the most amiable of men to take measures that must appear harsh; and the desire to avert an open scandal would furnish reasonable ground for putting the most culpable of the parties under secure restraint.

Raumer's investigations on this point were searching, and what he found appears to shatter effectually the theory on which the dramatists had built up their poetic structure. One of the incidents of their tragedy was the secret effort of Philip to get rid of an unfaithful spouse by poison, and at the same time be avenged on his unnatural son by having him murdered in prison. Indeed such was the open statement made by the Prince of Orange in his Apology for the Netherlands rising against the yoke of Spain. Little wonder that the dramatists should have seized on the story as a theme worthy of the age of Æschylus. Raumer could find no trace of justification for the charge. On the contrary, he finds that Carlos' conduct toward his royal stepmother, in the periods of his sanity was most circumspect, and at the same time filial. Raumer

gives proofs of his conclusions. He cites a large number. One or two will suffice to indicate their importance:

"In February, 1562, Cardinal Guibert wrote to Queen Catherine: 'King Philip continues to love his consort more and more. If others say to the contrary, that is all bugbears and lies; rather the consideration and influence of your daughter have tripled in the last three months, and her husband appears serene and contented.'

"In June, 1564, St. Sulpice writes: 'The Queen of Spain is good and handsome, and not less joyous and satisfied at her lord's return than she was troubled at his journey and long absence.'

"In 1565 the Queen made a journey to Bayonne, and the King and Don Carlos went to the frontier to meet her on her return. Cardinal Guibert wrote of the event: 'The King and Queen received each other as affectionately as can be imagined, and each tried which could show the other the most honor. . . . Prince Carlos rode three leagues to meet them (at Segovia); he approached the Queen on foot and labored to take her hand and kiss it; nor did she neglect to return his salutation. I can assure you, madame, that the Queen, your daughter, lives in the greatest contentment in the world, through the perfect kindness which the King, her husband, more and more shows her. . . . Moreover, the King has received such favorable reports of her virtuous conduct during the whole journey, and is so satisfied therewith, that he always loves, esteems and honors her.' "

About this period there had been some talk about the prince's future. His stepmother wished that he might be preserved for her sister, the Princess Margaret, and therefore was not partial to the proposal made by the Queen of Bohemia that her daughter, the Archduchess Anne, might be his bride—for royal ladies seemed to have a perpetual leap year's privilege in those days. St. Sulpice, in a letter of September, 1565, writes in a way that would indicate a partiality for the Archduchess (whose miniature, probably, had been sent him, as was the vogue in all such transactions, not always with the happiest results, as we know from the story of Henry VIII. and Anne of Cleves). He said:

"The King and Queen repaired to a country house, whither the prince came after his recovery. As he was one day driving out with the Queen and her ladies in the park, in a carriage drawn by oxen, he remained a long time silent, when the Queen asked him where he was with his thoughts. He answered, 'More than two hundred miles hence.' 'And where is that, so far off?' asked the Queen further. The prince rejoined: 'I am thinking of my cousin.' " Raumer believes this referred to the Archduchess, whose marriage with him was then under negotiation.

Those extracts proved to Raumer that the King and Queen lived happily and that Carlos and his stepmother lived on terms of affectionate friendship, and nothing else. The King's later suspicions lay evidently in quite a different direction. He had learned that his son was in a dangerous state of mind, intermittently, and that he aspired to be made Viceroy of the Netherlands. By January, 1568, matters had taken a serious turn, as shown by extracts from the letters of a new French Ambassador, Fourquevaux:

"The 14th instant the King sent orders to all the churches and cloisters in this town, commanding that at all Masses and all canonical hours prayers should be offered up imploring God to grant him counsel and inspiration relative to a plan which he broods in his heart. This has given all the curious of the court something to talk about, and I am not quite certain whether this refers to the prince. True it is, however, that long before his journey to the Escorial the King had not spoken to him, great discontent prevailed between them and the prince could not conceal the rancor he nourished in his heart against his father. Far from it, he indiscreetly said: 'Amongst five persons to whom I bear most ill will, the King is, after Ruy Gomez, the first.' To the charge of the last he lays whatever thwarts his wishes.

"It is well known that at Christmas time he did not receive the Communion or obtain any share in the jubilee because he would not renounce his hatred and forgive, whereupon his confessor would not give him absolution. Hereupon he applied to other theologians, but received the same answer. There are even people who say he intended to do his father an ill turn. But, however that be, the King last night went into the prince's room, found a loaded pistol in the bed and committed him to the charge of Ruy Gomez, the Duke of Feria, the Prior Antonio and Don Lope Quichada, with express orders that he should speak to no living soul save in their sight and hearing."

Previous to this open rupture it would seem that the unfortunate dreamer had been under a kind of informal surveillance, in the keeping of Don Juan of Austria. He believed that the latter was betraying his secrets, whatever they were, and grew morose and jealous of him. He insulted him, in the King's presence, and Don Juan gave up his charge and left the quarters assigned them.

King Philip was at pains to explain to the French Ambassador, as he wrote on the 5th of February, why he had had to adopt measures of restriction toward his son. He told him that he had become deranged, and that, after long hoping that he would recover his intellect, he was forced to conclude that the hope was vain.

He felt he could not intrust his subjects to Don Carlos, and was obliged to place him under restraint. The Ambassador learned from the talk about court that Don Carlos had acutally attempted to shoot Don Juan, after having, with the cunning of the insane, lured him into a spot where the deed might be done unnoticed, but that Juan was able to wrest the weapon from him as he was about to use it. He had also got a companion named Leava to lie in wait for Juan, with a similar intent, in case he himself failed.

These facts were not relied on by the King in his explanation to the Ambassador, but were commonly discussed in the court pre-cincts.

The next steps taken by the King were to gain possession of the prince's papers and make preparations for depriving him, by process of law, of the right of succession, as one unfit to govern.

The Queen was greatly grieved over these painful doings. She wept for two days, the Ambassador told her mother; but Raumer sees in this no evidence of a guilty attachment, as the dramatists sought to show existed.

The tragic story ended in a short time afterward. The Emperor intervened more than once on Carlos' behalf, for he had in his early days shown considerable liking for his grandson. But Philip was determined to brook no interference with his purposes. He politely refused all offers to take the prince off his hands; and in this he was acting for the peace of his kingdom, since wherever the Heir Apparent would be he must be a source of danger to the throne and the country, in view of his opposition to his father. The mode and manner of his death are not clearly shown, since the official letter on this point is missing from the Ambassador's correspondence, but that there was nothing to hide, on the King's part, is clearly proved by subsequent letters relating to the communication of the sad event to foreign States and the account of the prince's funeral and the mourning for his demise. These were precisely the same as though he had been King, in accordance with the traditional custom of the Spanish monarchy.

After examining all the available documents and weighing their import, as against the mass of rumor and fiction, Raumer sums up the case in judicial fashion, thus:

1. Carlos was from the first infirm in body and ill-disposed in mind. This last evil was, by the violence of his passions, aggravated even to madness, although periods of reason and repentance intervened.

2. In moments of violent passion the hatred which he undeniably cherished against his father may have brought forth thoughts and expressions tending toward his death.

3. Carlos was at all events incapable of governing, and sufficient grounds existed for keeping him under strict watchfulness.

4. He and the Queen died natural deaths, and never did the slightest affair of the heart occur between them.

It was an irresponsible romancer, Antonio Perez, who started the story of the prince's fate which gave the clue to the dramatists. The young man was clearly demented for a considerable time, and his dementia is clearly traceable to the accident to his head. He died in confinement, but by what form of disease there is no present means of pronouncing. He was no degenerate, in the sense of the term understood by Lombroso, but a degenerate by natural process, as most demented persons are.

Schiller's conception of Don Carlos seems to have been based upon the theory propounded by the fiction-mongers—namely, that he was persecuted by his father because he was an enlightened prince, the friend of liberty and progress and therefore opposed to his father's policy in the Netherlands. The assumption is entirely gratuitous. Thorough investigation of the whole sad history, by a competent and impartial witness, failed to bring any evidence whatever to show that any such grounds of difference existed. It is a story of unhappy domestic discord and the lamentable consequences of a pampered childhood and unbridled indulgence in the passions of youth. There is hardly a royal family in Europe of which a similar story could not be told at one time or other.

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

Philadelphia.

DO THE FILIPINOS REALLY HATE THE SPANISH FRIARS?

I

THERE are certain historical statements laid down by English and American writers as axioms, or self-evident propositions, not worth the trouble of proving or arguing about, so sure are the writers of the blind sympathy of their readers, shackled as they all are by a common tradition. They are therefore laid down as taken for granted and set forth with rhetorical and sentimental phrases which take the place of honest historical enquiry and truthfulness and serve to carry on the baseless tradition to a new generation. Of such a nature are the diatribes about Spanish tyranny and oppression of subject races, in plain contra-

diction to the known facts of history, Spain, the pioneer of religion and civilization in the New World and the Far East, having done more for subject races than any other European nation. Is it not a wonder that no one is bold enough to break with the false tradition and honestly tell the truth? But fiction is more palatable than truth in many instances to the generality of readers, and it is hard even for an independent mind to reject the venerable Protestant traditions about Spain and the Inquisition, brought three centuries ago to the shores of America by the English settlers and religiously believed in ever since.

It is to be feared that before long the alleged general hatred of the Filipinos for the Spanish friars will be embodied in the same category and placed beyond the reach of argument, so unanimous are the English and American writers, since the Americans landed in the Philippines, in propagating the idea. John Foreman, one of the meanest, most prejudiced and untruthful writers of our time, loudly proclaimed as the "standard authority on the Philippines," has set the pace, and, with the exception of Sawyer, an independent witness, the others have blindly followed in his footsteps. Even those who pose as especially independent inquirers, such as the journalist who was sent out this year to write up the islands for a newspaper syndicate, have paid attention merely to the one-sided evidence forced on every American in the Philippines, culpably neglecting to take into account the evidence that points to the opposite conclusion. I am aware that the quasi-judicial authority of the late Governor Taft may be quoted against me. In his report, written after taking evidence at the Commission on the Friars, he expresses himself to the effect that there existed a very general hostility to the friars, and that whether it was an unreasoning sentiment of an easily excitable people or was based on real grievances, it should be taken into account. Speaking afterwards in America he also said that the Filipinos owed all their civilization to the friars, but that the latter had made themselves odious to the people by acting as spies to the Spanish Government for the last half century. This testimony, coming from a man in his position, must have made a great impression in America, but it is not generally known that his means of observation were limited. With the exception of the evidence of the Bishops and provincials, to be quoted shortly, given at the Commission, he had no means of hearing the other side. During his sojourn in the Philippines Governor Taft had no means of learning the sentiments of the masses at first hand, and he was surrounded the whole time by the anti-friar clique, whose great object was to prejudice his mind against the friars and represent the people as wholly hostile to them. Both the Schurman and the

Taft Commissions, the printed reports of which got such a large circulation to form public opinion, was packed with anti-clericals, and no evidence was taken from any native in favor of the friars, one prominent Filipino, whose sentiments were well known, not having been asked any question on that subject during his examination. It would be impossible to find in any other printed book, especially of an official character, so many absurd, filthy and slanderous lies as were gathered together by the Taft Commission and published to the world by the Government at Washington. Yet this extraordinary compilation as much as any other agency has prejudiced public opinion on a question so very momentous to the Catholic Church and the religious orders. The sole redeeming feature of the publication is the evidence of the Bishops and the heads of the religious orders, clear, concise, conclusive and diametrically the opposite to that given by the other side. Want of fairness, however, is apparent even here from the fact that the defense of the friars was made first and could only be given in general terms, as they did not know what would be said against them by the witnesses for the prosecution, no chance being afterwards allowed of replying to specific odious charges made against them either individually or in general. The evidence should either not have been published at all, or, if published, the friars should have been allowed to answer to specific charges and have their answers embodied in the same publication.

The friars, who have lived for years in the country, who know the native languages, have had most intimate dealings as priests with the people and more opportunities for studying their character than any other class; who saw the approach of the revolution and went through the horrors of a long captivity, have never admitted a general hostility of the people towards them. Let us here bring together the evidence on this point, given by the Bishops, all friars, and the heads of the religious orders before the Taft Commission. The Archbishop of Manila's evidence was as follows:

"Q. And (the friars) being loyal to Spain and representing the Government of Spain in so many capacities, was it not natural that those who began the insurrection against Spain should have a hostility towards those representatives?

"A. It is very natural. All the more so since this feeling of enmity was not so much that of the great mass of the people as those who constituted this revolting element against the sovereignty of Spain."

The Bishop of Jaro in answer to questions said: "Antagonism or hostility on the part of the mass of the people does not exist. There is hostility against them (the friars) on the part of these

few half-educated men who have been conspirators against the Spanish Government, many of whom had to be deported from the islands. The real reason is, say what you may, the supporters of the Spanish sovereignty here were the priests, and that is the reason that it is only these men and not the masses of the people that are against them."

The provincial of the Dominican Order said: "As a matter of fact, among the mass of the people this hatred does not exist. It does exist among the Katipunans, and here and there among the better classes, but the whole reason of the hatred of this class against the priests lies in the fact that they were the bulwarks of Spanish sovereignty in the islands, and these people, recognizing their loyalty to their government, saw that in order to break down the sovereignty of Spain it was necessary to cast odium upon the religious orders and have them, if possible, expelled from the country."

The provincial of the Franciscans, on being asked if those in favor of the revolution were hostile to his order because they represented the Spanish Government, said: "That is not the case so far as the Franciscans are concerned, for when the insurrection broke out the natives got them out of the way, so that there would be no trouble in store for them. Even the money they had in their houses was sent to them to Manila by the insurgents."

The provincial of the Augustinians, in answer to the question whether he thought the friars of his order could return to their former parishes, said: "As soon as the Government of the United States has established its laws and there is personal security, I can state that the people are anxious to receive the priests back in their old parishes."

"Q. Are you in communication with the people back in the old parishes?"

"A. Yes, sir; we receive many letters from them. A great many from the various provinces I have mentioned come here and visit us, tell us about what is going on, and say we can go back at any time; but at the present time there is no personal security, everything being controlled by the Katipunans."

The provincial of the Recoletos testified to the same effect:

"Q. Any hostility to the Crown of Spain among the people was against the priest as representing the Government of Spain?"

"A. Absolutely. There was no resentment, or hostility, or ill-feeling whatever against the priests up to the time of the revolution, and that feeling has germinated right here in Manila and has spread from sources to be found here in Manila. There was really no feeling in the provinces against the priests, and, as I have said

before, this feeling was spread by the heads of the revolution, by those who had political aspirations and something to gain by a revolution. A great many of them came from Manila. They formed or were a part of the Spanish Government, that is, clerks, some of them in the courts, and as they knew a little more than the simple country people, they spread rumors against the priests when they went to the small towns, and as the latter made efforts to protect the people hostile feeling was awakened."

This is strong and unanimous testimony coming from learned ecclesiastics occupying high positions, and, as superiors, holding intimate relations with the friars and native secular clergy all over the archipelago. It ought indeed to bring conviction to an unbiased mind. During the four years that have passed since that evidence was given the friars have not seen fit to revise their position. What a pity that authors and journalists do not listen to their side of the case before committing themselves so confidently to print.

American opinion in the islands is mostly worthless, formed as it is at haphazard and by the slippery and mendacious Filipinos these residents come in contact with, many of whom would express the very opposite sentiments to the friars themselves. The ordinary half-educated Filipino generally says what he thinks will please, and it takes a long time to know him and find out his real sentiments. I have had some curious experiences of this side of the Filipino character. I have been speaking to men who were apparently very much against the friars as long as they did not know I was one, but when I declared myself it was amusing to notice how their faces brightened up with joy and how, without any sense of shame, they declared themselves great friends of the friars and spoke of this and the other father with marks of affection.

My experience in Manaoag, in the province of Pangasinan, where I lived in the convent with four other Dominican friars for three months, all tended to confirm the impression that the poorer classes of the population at any rate still looked with reverence and affection on the Spanish friar. It is true that there as elsewhere there were three or four friar-haters, one of whom had gained notoriety during the revolution for his cruelties; but with these exceptions the relations between the fathers and the people were of the best. This was patent to any observer from the way the services in the church were attended, the confessionals frequented and the convent approached daily by numbers both from the village and from other parts to consult the fathers about their affairs. What was remarkable to me was the general custom of men, women and children going out of their way to salute us by kissing our

hands, the men with uncovered heads. This practice was not confined to the people of the village. As the road that passed the convent led direct to Benguet, where the Americans are employing thousands of laborers in laying a new road through the mountains, not an evening passed without our meeting with long lines of carts driven by men from distant pueblos, the customary salute from those being more general than among our own villagers, some of whom were afraid to make a display of their feelings for fear of the local anti-friars. Every year at the great festival held about Easter time thirty or forty thousand people came from all parts of Pangasinan and neighboring provinces to pay their devotions, and the fathers were kept busy in the confessionals from morning till night for several days, the concourse being actually greater than it was before the revolution, when everything was tranquil.

It might be inferred from this that the fathers had found no difficulty in returning to Manaoag after the revolution and the war. But such is the determination of the anti-friar party and the timidity of the people that it was only by strategem they were able to re-establish themselves there after an absence of four years. When they came the native priest who had invited them back and gave them shelter in his house, the convent being occupied at the time by American troops, received anonymous letters threatening him with death if he did not send them away, and it is not at all improbable that the threat would have been carried into effect only for the presence of the Americans. When the fathers afterwards took possession of the convent such was the terrorism exercised that they found it impossible for some time to get servants, and it was only gradually that their friends took courage to approach them.

An incident which occurred during my stay in the place shows to what absurd deception the anti-friar party will descend to bolster up the deception that the friars are hated by the people, even given the plainest evidence to the contrary. A few days before Rosary Sunday last year the native parish priest went to Manila to be present at the reception of Dr. Dougherty, one of the American Bishops, remaining as a guest in the Dominican convent during his stay in the city. On the following Sunday the great procession of the Rosary took place in the evening, about four thousand people marching in it under the direction of the four Dominican friars. It took about two hours to go round the village, was very grand and impressive, and as far as I could judge very orderly. I heard afterwards, however, that a slight disturbance had taken place, owing to a man breaking through the files and walking between them with his hat on. It was over in two minutes. This was the occasion of one of the anti-friar party, probably the very author of the dis-

turbance, writing a puerile travesty of the incident to the Filipino papers in Manila, to the effect that the native priest had been driven from the village by the friars and had gone to complain about them to Manila; that the people when they saw that the procession was headed by the friars were furious; that the women threw off their veils and attacked the friars with the candles they held in their hands, and that the friars, who were bruised considerably by the treatment they received, went to the president of the village to complain, but got his answer that he could do nothing for them. These childish absurdities, which are a fair specimen of the unscrupulous methods used to deceive the people, were cautiously inserted in that part of the paper printed in the native Tagalo language, for fear that if inserted in Spanish there might be a contradiction and prosecution for libel. This year, unfortunately, the Katipunans succeeded in almost destroying the great Easter religious gathering. Violence and robbery took place along the roads leading to the village just as the pilgrimage began, false reports were spread about, and, sad to say, hardly more than four or five thousand people were brave enough to come to fulfil their religious duties out of the vast multitude that had come on the two previous years. It is plain that tyranny and intimidation of the worst description exists in the archipelago, practised by a political party which to satisfy virulent hatred and gain ignoble ends thinks nothing of depriving their fellow-countrymen of the consolations of the Catholic religion.

Under the plea that a general hostility towards the friars existed among the Filipinos, the Insular Government entered into an agreement with the Delegate Apostolic that the friars should not be sent back to their former parishes, unless the people of the parish petitioned for them. Petitions of this nature had already been coming in to the American authorities, and previous to that to Aguinaldo from the beginning of the revolution, when he held more than four hundred friars in captivity. On the agreement becoming generally known, petitions came pouring in from all sides in spite of the vigilance of the anti-friar party and the cowardice of the people. Strange to say, for some occult reason that has never been explained, the petitions were laid aside, notably in the case of the Macabebe people, enthusiastic supporters of the friars, who sent in petitions several times over. In other instances the petition was sent back to the leading anti-friars, who by their well-known methods of intimidation got up a counter petition to render the first nugatory. Sometimes the petition never reached its destination, as the provincial governor might insist on its going through his hands, which meant its going into the fire immediately after.

Even when a petition takes effect and a friar is sent to a parish every effort is made by the anti-friars to drive him out by violence. Just as insurgent plans and raids are directed from Manila, the anti-friar campaign gets its guidance and inspiration from the same centre. A short time ago some friars were ministering peaceably in a certain parish and everything was going on quietly when word was received from Manila by the president to know why he allowed the friars to remain there. He answered that the people were very fond of them; that they were good men, and that things were going on harmoniously. "We don't want to know that," was the answer he received; "all we want to know is what steps have you taken to put them out?"

A few examples will be of service in throwing light on this peculiar situation. The people of the town of Dumaguete, the capital of Eastern Negros, petitioned for a friar. Their sentiments towards the friars were well known to the revolutionists, for when the friars had to fly just as the Tagalo revolutionary bands were expected from Manila, the people in great grief crowded round the vessel imploring the friars not to abandon them. When the Tagalos appeared they abandoned their homes and fled up the mountains. Their petition was acceded to and a Recoleta friar was sent to them. But the president of the town, evidently acting under instructions, calling out the police, unwilling instruments in his hands, advanced to the friar armed with a revolver, just as he was approaching the convent and drove him out of the town by force. He then sent word along the coast to the other presidents to act in a similar way if a friar attempted to enter the towns. When notice of the affair was sent to Manila and the matter came to light the president was promptly suspended by the American Governor. Nevertheless the harm was done and the people have not been able to get a friar ever since. Under a new president several petitions have been sent for friars to Manila, but the provincial governor, a brother of the late suspended president and an open sympathizer with a Protestant proselytizing institution in the town, is powerful enough to hinder them from taking effect.

The following instance will show pretty clearly how one of the principal difficulties encountered is the cowardice of the people, who, in spite of their good-will, allow themselves to be cowed by armed ruffians. Another Recoleta friar, Father Callisto Gaspar, about two years ago received a letter from the native priest of Camigen, province of Misamis, Mindanao, asking him to come back to his old parish of Mambajan, where he had ministered for sixteen years, and adding that the leading men of the various pueblos round about were all anxious for his return. The work was press-

ing too hard on the native priest and his assistant, as thirty thousand souls had to be looked after, who had been attended to before the revolution by four Recoleta friars. This was by no means the first intimation he got of the wishes of the people, for his return to the parish had been solicited the very year he had been forced to fly. Father Gaspar now put the matter before the ecclesiastical authorities, and they readily consented to his return. Accordingly he sailed for Mindanao, to the town where the native priests were and made his way to the convent, getting hearty salutations from all sides from the people. The president of the town paid him a friendly visit and asked him to stay in his house, where he would be safe from the violence of any malcontents who might attempt to molest him, but the friar decided to remain in the convent. He had a busy day in the church, as the people were flocking the whole day to the confessional. In the meantime, however, a Tagalo, who had settled in Mindanao several years before and had apparently been a great friend of the friars before the revolution, organized a small band of roughs and in the evening as Father Gaspar was in the upper corridor of the convent showers of stones were hurled against the windows. A notice, too, was fixed on the doors of the convent ordering him to quit. At the first intimation of violence the native priest gave way to fright and locked himself in his room, and it was with the greatest difficulty that the friar succeeded in getting him to sign a requisition to the president for protection. His hand shook so much that he could hardly hold the pen. The president on getting this notice sent a guard of police to the convent and kept them there during the three following nights. In the morning after the disturbance crowds assembled at the convent condoling with the friar and protesting that it was all the work of a few ruffians. It was a pity that they could not bring themselves to make a more energetic protest at night instead of shutting themselves up in their houses. During the following three days the people took advantage of the friar's presence and flocked to the church, keeping him busy in the confessional all the time. On the fourth day he and the native priest started on horseback for the town of Mambajan, where Father Gaspar had ministered as parish priest for sixteen years. On arriving at a village on the way the native priest got down and entered a house, leaving the friar by himself on the road in conversation with a friend. While thus engaged a man came up and threw a large stone at him, hitting him in the face. He was informed at the same time that a man was posted behind the house armed with a revolver and ready to shoot him if he proceeded on his journey, and that there were others lurking there armed with daggers. The end was that the

native priest, overcome with fright, insisted that his only course, owing to the hostility of these desperadoes, was to go back by the same steamer which brought him and which was still lying in the harbor. Judging it necessary himself, as he had been basely deserted by the priest and people who should have supported him, he left, and the consequence is that for more than a year thirty thousand people have been without the services of a resident priest, the two native priests having gone elsewhere. The occasional visit of a Jesuit father from another mission is all the priestly ministrations the people can get.

Shortly afterwards Father Gaspar received a petition from the people of a town in the Island of Bohol asking him to go there as parish priest. He forwarded the petition in due course to Manila, but that was the last heard of it. Many other petitions have been sent from Bohol, but they likewise appear to have been all shelved. Moreover, deputations have come from the island to the Recoleta friars in Cebu praying them to return, but in spite of their willingness to go the necessary formal authorization could not be obtained. Before the revolution forty Recoleta friars ministered in the island to a population of 300,000 souls. There was only one Spaniard there besides themselves, the lieutenant of the Guardia Civil, who with twelve native guards kept the whole island in order. It was a crimeless island, murder and robbery being unknown, and, needless to say, the relations between the fathers and this simple people were of the best. At present, owing to the enforced absence of the friars, the spiritual wants of this vast population are left to the attendance of fifteen native priests.

A little more courage and determination on the part of the people is all that is required. In a town in the Island of Cebu an Augustinian friar well liked by the people had been ministering some time, when a new president, appointed by the Governor of Cebu, appeared on the scene and wishing to show his authority, ordered him out. Finding that the friar took no heed and that he would have to resort to violence, the president brought in some ignorant half-savage men from the mountains and got them to begin a noisy demonstration in front of the convent preparatory to an attack. The American school teacher in the town, who knew the circumstances, was roused out of his sleep by some of the townspeople, who came to inform him of the outrage and beg him to accompany them and defend the friar. Seizing a revolver and the American flag, he went to the president's house, told him he was going to place the flag over the convent and that if it was attacked he would hold him responsible for an insult to the flag and would come back and shoot him dead. The president very prudently left

his house and ordered the disturbers away, and from that night the friar did not suffer any further molestation.

During the time that Mgr. Chapelle was Delegate Apostolic in the Philippines the people of Calamba, the town belonging to the great estate of the Dominicans, petitioned for the Dominican father who had been parish priest there before the revolution. He was thereupon sent by the Delegate and received with delight by the people. Presents of food poured into the convent, and the friar could go about where he liked, though the country at the time was in a very disturbed state. A few of the anti-friar party went to the commander of the American garrison and represented to him that the friar was in league with the insurgents. This impressed the officer and he sent for the friar and asked him how it was he was able to go about alone and unarmed while his own soldiers hardly dared to venture any distance from the barracks for fear of an attack. "How is it," he added, "that you are able to get all the food you want for nothing, and we find it hard to get anything at all even for good payment?" No explanation would satisfy the officer that he had come to no understanding with the insurgents, and he ordered him back to Manila at once. The idea now impressed on American teachers and others in Calamba is, as I know well, that no friar dare venture back for fear of the vengeance of the people.

I visited an island in the south containing a population of 10,000 souls which before the revolution had had a community of five or six Recoleta friars in their midst, who attended to their spiritual wants, and like everywhere else had given them in the course of years whatever civilization they possessed. At present they have no resident priest at all, though they get a visit from one from time to time. However, every Sunday the church bell rings and the people assemble as usual to say the Rosary and sing hymns. I saw and heard enough to convince me that the people would welcome back at any time the Recoleta friars and that the latter are kept out by three or four Tagalos who settled there during the revolution, having come as part of the insurgent garrison. Immediately after the revolution the Recoleta friars returned at the desire of the people, but these Tagalos went to the American Governor and got him to send them away. The present Governor, a native, is in reality well inclined towards the friars and visited them in Manila up to some time ago, but in order to stand in well with the Federal party and make sure of the governorship he broke off relations with them and consented to make a show of opposition against them. It is hard to measure the strength of this party, combining as it does the force of open party politics with the

methods of a secret society. A test of its influence is the fact that at the last elections a candidate for provincial governor who was duly and legally elected could not get his election confirmed by the American authorities, the only apparent reason being his friendliness towards the friars, while candidates in other provinces of well-known revolutionary principles got their elections confirmed without difficulty.

Great numbers of Filipinos of the better class desire that their children should receive a religious education at the hands of the friars, and the latter found no difficulty in filling their colleges in Manila immediately after the war. As the Dominican fathers had colleges also in Tuguegarao, of the province of Cagayan, and Dagupan, of the province of Pangasinan, both of which provinces had been under their spiritual guidance, they availed themselves of the first opportunity that offered to return to these colleges and set them in working order again. They found, however, that they had to deal with the same factious opposition from the anti-friar party that the friars of all the orders had met with on their return to their parishes. In Tuguegarao the opposition was led by the governor, a Tagalo, and his party, composed principally of Tagalos likewise. In spite of the opposition the friars persevered and opened their school, which was soon filled with pupils. The unexpected result was that the following year, at the commencement exercises and banquet, some of the leaders of the opposition party were present as friends and the most laudatory speech of all was that made by the governor himself. The opposition in Dagupan, a great Aglipayan centre, was more of a rowdy character, noisy demonstrations being made in front of the college and violent and abusive letters written to the Filipino press about the "cynical friars who had come to disturb the peace of the town." The governor of the province, an Aglipayan, being prevailed on to write to the late Governor Taft, received in answer a clear statement of the rights of the friars as ordinary citizens; that as such they were at liberty like any one else to go about and settle down wherever they liked, and that if the parishioners were not pleased with their spiritual ministrations they were not bound to accept them and could go to some other place of worship. This memorable letter, defining the rights of the friars, created a great impression all over the archipelago, and if it had been written two years previously it would have hindered a great deal of injustice. At present the college in Dagupan has a fair number of pupils and the services of the fathers as confessors are in constant requisition in the parish church.

In addition to the political reasons, already indicated, for the

opposition shown by a few to the return of the friars to the parishes, due weight should be given to local and personal reasons as well. During the revolution all the convents were stripped of their furniture, libraries and other valuables, which generally found their way into the houses of some of the leading men of the towns. I have seen the books of the convent of Manaoag piled up in a house not far off used as a post office, to which we often had to go with our letters. As these thieves and holders of stolen property have no intention of restitution and know that if the friars return they will soon be made aware of where their property is, they are naturally to be found in the opposition party. Again, a great many murders, robbery of the poor and weak and other acts of tyranny and inhumanity committed during the revolution have never come to light. Many are in peaceable possession of property robbed during that troubled time. Everywhere there is systematic oppression, the poorer classes laboring like slaves without hope of reward to pay off pretended debts; and it will be many years before the Americans, if ever at all, will be able to get at the root of the evil.

AMBROSE COLEMAN, O. P.

Limerick, Ireland.

"UPON THIS ROCK."

UBI PETRUS, IBI ECCLESIA.

I.

PERSONAL insignificance, even when so entire as in the case of the present writer, may sometimes be useful in helping towards the solution of a great question. The reasons (so far as they can be expressed in the brief space at my command) which led even one obscure, unknown English parson to come back to the faith of his fathers may possibly be of some little service on this very account—that there can be no glamor of intellectual eminence, influence or learning about the writer, and therefore what force his reasons may possess will be the result simply of their own cogency.

Though my own position was such as I have described it, I have had (and trust I still have) the privilege of being brought into contact, and not seldom into intimate and affectionate relationship, with much that is best and highest in Anglican thought and life. For this I can feel nothing but gratitude; while at the same time it is impossible not to realize that, in my own case and in

countless others, this very fact has for years hindered the true character of Anglicanism, or the imperative claims of the Catholic Church, from being realized. There is nowadays in the Church of England so much that is like the old religion and so much honest conviction that it is in fact that religion and *nothing* else—it is so possible to hold and to teach, without effectual interference, almost the whole of Catholic truth—that the dividing line between the Church and all outside her borders, so unmistakably clear two generations ago, is *from the Anglican side* (never of course from that of the Church) strangely obscured. Besides this, the sections into which the Church of England is split up, though there is far more mutual courtesy and social friendliness than there was thirty or forty years back, are probably more deeply divided than ever in their real principles and aims. There is much in the belief of the so-called “extreme” members of the High Church section that they never dream of discussing beyond their immediate ecclesiastical circle; they have ideals, hopes, aims of their own which they know would inexpressibly shock and scandalize their Protestant-minded brethren; amongst themselves they accept and practise everything the Church believes and practises, so far as they know how, with the single exception of submission to the claims of the Holy See. The laity are quite as enthusiastic as the clergy, and often more desirous of external advance. And the natural result is that to many it seems as if all that is necessary for the life and worship of the Church is really possessed, and that in perseverance in their present position lies the way to that reunion which was the avowed end of the Tractarian revival, and is the aim and prayer of all devout and consistent “Anglo-Catholics.”

All this, really excellent as it is in its absolute good faith and its earnest spirit of self-sacrifice, leads almost imperceptibly to the unconscious creation of a “fools’ paradise.” There is an inevitable tendency to identify one’s own immediate surroundings with the general body of Anglicanism; one’s own aims with the general drift of the communion to which one belongs; and to ignore the terrible truths of past history and of present scandal.

These are some of the causes that keep back many souls from submission and reconciliation; that explain the long delays and the weighing of arguments for perhaps many years, and that explain, too, the indisputable good faith of the lingerers.

II.

High-church Anglicans are divided into strata that, however they appear united, are really based on different principles. There are the successors of the old “High and Dry” party—good if not

very intelligent people, who are prepared to defend every Anglican inconsistency, and who hold a brief for every corruption and every compromise. There are, again, those who rise far above this poor level, but whose sympathies are cramped and whose rational grasp of facts and principles is hopelessly weakened by a supposed necessity of squaring all belief and practice to the later traditions and usages of "our Church"—a body which, on their own theory, can at best be nothing more than certain isolated provinces of the Universal Church. These well-meaning people have often such words as "primitive" and "catholic" on their lips, but their meaning is always bounded by what is strictly limited in time and narrowly local as to place. In fact, they glory in the idea, wholly anti-Christian (in the ordinary sense) as it is, of a "National Church," and their appeal to the first four or the first six centuries (or whatever the number may be) is always conditioned by how far the Book of Common Prayer is supposed to sanction universal law or custom, or the teaching and practice of the saints! This is the popular party at present in the Church of England; it is beloved by Bishops, has supplied candidates for not a few high places and is even reckoned with by ministers.

Beyond these and altogether different in spirit are the clergy and laity—comparatively few in number, but with scarcely an exception animated by intense conviction and reality—who practically accept the whole faith and discipline of the Church with the exception of the claims of the Holy See, on the principle that whatever the "Undivided Church" (*i. e.*, the Church up to the time of the Photian schism) has regarded as Catholic must be so regarded by all faithful Christians. There is no question in this section of the Anglican body as to such truths as the Sacrifice of the Mass, Penance, Purgatory and the present reign of the saints with Christ in heaven; and by most the Immaculate Conception of our Lady is devoutly recognized as at least a "pious opinion." Catholic practice as to fasting, communion, confession, prayers and sacrifice for the departed, invocation of our Lady and the saints are accepted as matter of course. The members of this section believe, as is indeed the historical fact, that the adherents of the old religion, waiving the one point of the supremacy of the Pope, were intended to be included in the Anglican compromise. They point to the very title page of the Prayer Book, in which the clearest distinction is made between the "Church of England" and "the [whole Catholic] Church," of which it is assumed to be a part; and if the whole is greater than its part, they argue with evident justice that the documents of the provincial church must be interpreted by the mind of the whole body, and not vice versa. Reunion with the

Apostolic See is recognized as absolutely necessary for the *bene esse* of the Church; the English provinces are considered as unhappily separated, though still possessing order and probably jurisdiction; and the duty of waiting and doing one's best, however small, to win back the Anglican communion to Catholic unity is much dwelt and insisted upon.

There are a few clergymen, it is said, who go beyond this position and accept unhesitatingly the Vatican definitions of 1870. I never met any of these as an Anglican, and I am sure that the few who are reported (if the report is true) to take this line are not acting with any consciousness of bad faith; but it would be difficult to imagine any satisfactory defense for their position which probably they have never logically faced.

III.

I have gone into the present state of matters among Anglican High Churchmen at some length, partly because it may help to explain the action (or inaction) of many men who appear to be sitting on the ecclesiastical fence, and partly because I am convinced that comparatively few Catholics realize what are the convictions that at once draw so many close (as it seems) to the door of the Church and yet hinder them from taking the last step across the threshold.

In my own case growth of conviction was always slow, and as I became persuaded of the truth of one point after another in the Catholic religion, I found in the school I have spoken of the satisfaction I sought for my faith and worship. Ever since religious questions began to take a conscious and practical hold of my life I have regarded the Roman Church with extreme reverence and even affection; but side by side with this existed a great devotion to the Church of England, which I learnt to look upon as a part of the Western Church, separated, through her children's sins, from external communion with the rest of Christendom. Possessing, as I believed she did, the Holy Mass and the sacraments through the preservation of sacred orders at the time of the schism, I clung to the hope that it was but a question of time before she would be once more restored to her lost privileges. The "branch theory" never had the least attraction for me; it seemed a contradiction in terms, and to imply that there was no parent trunk, or if there were, there could be no question as to how the trunk from which our supposed "branch" had sprung regarded our position.

IV.

I had the great privilege in my early days, partly before and

partly after my ordination as an Anglican cleric, of being brought into close contact with some of those to whom the Church of England owes all that is best and strongest in her to-day. At Cambridge the influence and guidance of the Rev. Edmund G. Wood, now vicar of St. Clement's in that town, and one of the most learned sons of his alma mater, led me to look at the Christian religion from an intellectual and a moral point of view more seriously than I had hitherto done. From him I learnt, what even then I had for years suspected, that loyalty to the Christian tradition of all ages meant something totally different from ordinary Anglican faith and practice. I shall never forget the first sermon I heard him preach, when he was yet personally unknown to me and I was a young undergraduate, on the merits of the saints. Still less can I be unmindful of his unwearied patience and ever-ready help, which has continued through many years and to which I know I should never turn in vain.

After taking my degree I spent a year at Cuddesdon Theological College, and while finding all kindness and making many friendships there, I was much disappointed at the intensely "moderate" tone of the college. The lectures were, of course, regulated in a large degree by the requirements of the Bishops' examinations, and were consequently as a whole small enough preparation for what I believed to be the Catholic priesthood. But the vice principal was Mr. Gore, afterwards canon of Westminster Abbey, Anglican Bishop of Worcester and now of Birmingham. To him I owe a deep debt of gratitude, and, if he will permit me to say so, of affection. His lectures on Church history led me first to any real appreciation of the true historical sense, and the private instruction in philosophy he was good enough to give me did more for me intellectually than he could have suspected. The books I read under his direction and the never-to-be-forgotten discussions of their contents gave me a mental foundation on which, alas! I have built all too sparingly.

On my ordination I worked for some time in the Diocese of Durham, then ruled by that kindest and most tolerant of Anglican prelates, Dr. Lightfoot. The diocese was just beginning to recover from the unintelligent, if consistent, puritanism of his predecessor, and the small handful of Catholic-minded clergy and laity were full of the hope of better things which the appointment of Dr. George Body as canon missionary did much to encourage. I fear that hope is still waiting for its realization. Then I went to Scotland on the invitation of Dr. Chinnery-Haldane, Anglican Bishop of Argyll and the Isles, a man whom to know is to respect and love, and who stands almost or quite alone among the Anglican "Home Episco-

pate" for his grasp of sacramental truth and his courage in proclaiming it. After taking charge for nearly three years of the newly-established mission of Inveraray I went to Edinburgh and worked for some years as assistant curate of All Saints' parish, of which Canon Alexander Murdoch had been for long and is still the deservedly esteemed rector.

From this time onwards I had the privilege of enjoying the friendship of several of the mission clergy of the Society of St. John the Evangelist, and my visits to the Anglican monastery at Cowley, Oxford, I always regard as among the specially happy episodes of my life. One retreat, conducted by Father Maturin, now for many years a Catholic, left an abiding influence on my mind and probably worked indirectly in leading me on towards the Church.

V.

While at All Saints' I received and accepted the offer of the rectorship of St. Michael's, in the same city, in succession to my very dear friend, Provost Ball, now of Cumbrae Cathedral. The church had notable traditions, extending already over nearly thirty years. The congregation, which was at first connected with a religious community whose chapel was open for public services, had from its beginning been accustomed not only to the ordinary ceremonial of the Mass, but to such ceremonies as those peculiar to Candlemas, Ash Wednesday and the last days of Holy Week. During my twelve years as rector everything external was maintained almost as I found it. The people were practically unanimous, loyal and affectionate, and I can never forget how they stood by me in various times of difficulty. Almost all came to confession; the fast before Communion was practised as a matter of course; not to assist at Mass on Sundays and holy days of obligation was recognized as grievous sin; our Blessed Lady received, I may say without presumption, our earnest love and true homage, and on her festivals and throughout her "own sweet month of May" her shrine blazed with lights and was fragrant with the flowers brought by pious hands; the other devotions of the months, such as the Sacred Heart, the Precious Blood and the Holy Souls, were also observed. Along with this there was the most rigid loyalty to the Book of Common Prayer, and never a day passed (unless through absence or urgent necessity) when the Communion service was not celebrated and the Anglican offices of morning and evening prayer duly recited. The evening services, except on Sundays (when evening prayer was sung with the usual ceremonial of Solemn Vespers) were very frequently non-liturgical and included the Sta-

tions of the Cross, devotions on the mysteries of our redemption and mission preaching.

VI.

Possessed, as we believed, of all these privileges and even luxuries of the Catholic religion, what wonder is it that many of us were filled with hope of a better future for the whole communion to which we belonged? In 1896 things seemed at their best. Lord Halifax (most honored of all Anglican laymen and most worthy of honor) had sounded in the councils of the English Church Union a clearer note than ever calling for a better understanding and a closer rapprochement between the English provinces (as we considered them) and the Western Church. A Pontiff whose whole soul was on fire with longing for the reunion of all who bore the name of Christian sat on the throne of St. Peter. It was known that a number of French ecclesiastics were disposed to look favorably on the question of Anglican ordinations. There was manifest on both sides a softening of prejudice and a mutual willingness to enter into each other's position, of which the *Revue Anglo-Romaine* was one notable fruit and evidence.

Then came, as the result of patient and earnest investigation, the authoritative decision of the Holy See declaring the ordinations of the Anglican Church to be wholly null and void. The more thoughtful minds amongst us had realized beforehand that whatever the decision might be, the real question of the relations between the Holy See and the English Church would still await solution. The possession of the Sacrament of Holy Order, and therefore of all the other sacraments, does not by itself make a religious society part of the Church of Christ. As has been excellently said, it is not the orders that make the Church, but the Church that makes the orders. And it was not to be expected on the Anglican side that those who for generations had disregarded the utterances of the Apostolic See, and whose peculiar ecclesiastical position was based on that very disregard, would be greatly moved by this particular utterance. I do not remember that any special dismay was caused amongst us by the pronouncement; a dozen specious reasons were put forward in order to nullify the effect of the bull. It was insinuated that the decision was to be explained by the supposed necessity of maintaining a precedent already established; at least one ecclesiastical journal attributed the terms of the bull to pressure from Westminster and the English hierarchy. It was pointed out that this, not being a pronouncement as to faith or morals, another Papal utterance might conceivably take another line. For those who did not acknowledge the central authority of the Catholic

Church the question was essentially an academic one, which admitted of plausible argument in either direction. Those who were troubled by the decision felt distress rather at the apparent increase of difficulties in the way of reunion than any increase of disquiet as to their own position. It is strange, certainly, that it never seems to strike an Anglican that not only the Apostolic See and all Western Christendom, but every religious body that, on the Anglican theory, may possibly belong to the Church, practically sides with Rome in this controversy. The "Jansenist" Bishops of Holland are as clear on the point as the Pope himself. It would be as impossible for an Anglican clergyman to celebrate the liturgy at the Cathedral of the Assumption in Moscow as to say Mass at St. Peter's or St. John Lateran.

However, strange though it may seem, that was not the trouble. The real misery that, little spoken of but ever growing, worked in myself and I cannot but believe in hundreds of my brethren, was to see the utter lack of desire for unity on the part of our spiritual rulers. The Bishop of my own diocese delivered a charge during that year which showed how completely such a desire, in any Catholic sense, was absent from his mind. Those who were working and praying for the peace of the City of God were spoken of in a tone of contemptuous dislike. On the other hand, those admittedly, on the Anglican theory, outside the Church were approached and flattered as if nearer to us than those whom we claimed as our brethren in the one body. And my diocesan was far from standing alone. Once again, as always, the Anglican claim on paper and in practice stood in striking contrast.

VII.

For eight years the thought that it might be impossible for me to remain where I was grew more pressing, though I tried with all my might to combat it so far as I could do so without violation to conscience and disregard of admitted truth. I dreaded the strengthening of what might come to be inevitable conviction, and on this account said next to nothing on the subject even to my closest friends. When conversation turned on the "Roman Question" I clutched at every possible argument against breaking with all my traditions and all my desires.

In 1898 the Bishop of the diocese, owing to representations made by irresponsible and mischievous persons, involved himself and me in a long and tedious controversy, which naturally led to no satisfactory result from any point of view. I agreed, in correspondence with His Lordship's desire, to forego the public use of the Hail

Mary, and wrote him an open letter of amazing futility, in which I declared, as any humble disciple of Sancta Clara, Cardinal Newman and Bishop Forbes could do without scruple, my adhesion to the twenty-second "Article of Religion." The Bishop's charge that year was mainly directed against the Catholic practice of invocation in general, and against myself in particular. I am quite sure he desired to act with even-handed justice, and even with kindness; it is not him, but the hopeless position of an Anglican prelate, that I blame for a stupid incident that brought nothing but annoyance to him, the parish and myself.

One point was, however, brought out in strong relief—that, whatever the theory might be, there was for Anglicans no appeal beyond the narrow limits of a single country and three and a half centuries. If no Church of England divine had sanctioned a doctrine or practice since 1549—*causa finita est*. On the theory "our Church" claimed as her own the English Bishops from St. Augustine to Cardinal Pole no less than since the great schism; and it was not easy to see, if the claim was genuine, why the authority of Archbishop Cranmer was to have more weight than that of St. Anselm, or the practice of Dr. Parker to be decisive as against that of St. Thomas the Martyr or Stephen Langton.

VIII.

It was impossible not to see, with unspeakable distress, that neither authority nor unity had any meaning to our rulers as a whole. The voice of the Church, even on the Anglican theory, was ignored as if it were a foreign tongue that had no interpreter. One's ears were wearied and one's heart made sick with the rubbish talked and written about "*our Church*." And any higher or broader line was stigmatized as disloyalty—to *what* it was difficult to say.

An example of this spirit was given me at a meeting of our local clerical society, at which, by request, I read a paper on the devotion due to our Blessed Lady and the saints. I had taken a line which seemed to me moderate almost to a fault, but to my dismay my essay was criticized as if I had uttered some serious heresy against faith or morals. It was obvious that "*Ora pro nobis*," *on Anglican grounds*, had the sanction of the "Undivided Church," and yet most even of those with whom one had the closest sympathy failed on this question of authority and appeared to think that "*our Church*" was free to take her own line on this question, and, by implication, on heaven knows what besides.

I may be allowed, perhaps, to take two points; one of belief and

one of discipline, as illustrating how the Anglican profession of loyalty to the "Undivided Church" breaks down in practice.

1. The Real Presence of Christ under the forms of bread and wine in the Holy Mass. On all sides it is admitted that this truth is one obviously taught by the "Undivided Church," as Anglicans understand the expression. Yet its absolute denial is not only tolerated but in practice encouraged. Archbishop Temple in one of his latest charges publicly stated his conviction that an Anglican might lawfully hold (and a clergyman by implication teach) any doctrine of the Blessed Eucharist, from a denial that just escaped the barest Zwinglianism, to an affirmation that included the materialistic and unphilosophical Lutheran heresy of consubstantiation. According to the Archbishop there was only one doctrine incompatible with membership in the Church of England—the teaching of the Catholic Church as defined by the Council of Trent and also by the Synod of Bethlehem.

2. Fasting Communion. There is and can be no controversy as to the practice of the "Undivided Church" as to the obligation. And yet the Church of England encourages in every way the disregard of such discipline, and the official utterances of many of her Bishops show as complete misunderstanding of the *raison d'être* of the Church's law as they do contempt for her authority.

From this and a score of other points equally easy to recognize it seemed to follow of necessity:

1. Either the Anglican Church is not a mere part, and a very small part, of Christendom, bound as such to submit to the decision and authority of the whole, but is herself the whole and therefore supreme and infallible; or,

2. The unreality of her position and her revolt from Catholic unity are self-evident.

IX.

I held on to the last possible moment; but for the incessant and absorbing work of a large town parish I should probably have made my submission long before. There did not appear sufficiently strong conviction as to justify me in leaving work and people solemnly, as I believed, committed to my care. But the question grew: *Where* was I? Did my surroundings encourage me to persist in the belief that I was indeed in the Church of St. Gregory and St. Augustine, St. Cuthbert and St. Wilfrid, Blessed John Cardinal Fisher, Blessed Thomas More and all the English martyrs? Would they acknowledge me and the communion to which I belonged? Other men could no doubt conscientiously answer the question, for a time at least, affirmatively. I could not in the end

escape the fact that seemed clear as daylight that every one of these would have told me that except on the *soliditas cathedrae Petri* there was no common standing ground for them and for me.

And again: By what authority did I believe and try to practise the religion that was my very life? On that of the Anglican Church? To begin with, there was no telling exactly what her religion was; she tolerated not merely schools of thought, but definitely divergent faiths. And so far as she had an audible voice, that voice did not certainly teach as I taught. On that of the whole Catholic Church? But *her* Living Voice denied that I had part or lot with her. It was no question of vestments or incense, or even of orders or liturgies. The one thing that mattered was, where was the authority that had divine right to tell a man what he must believe and do in order to accomplish God's will and save his soul?

X.

The gift of faith came at last like a lightning flash, and suddenly I saw I could not go on even for another day as I was. God's truth stood revealed; there could be no further delay. On other grounds I had resigned the parish, and I saw clearly that for the present at least there was no more definite work for me in the Anglican Church. My intention was to wait for some months and then to be received, if it came to that, abroad. But God spoke—and there was nothing left but to obey.

The religion I had taught and practised was, as a collection of doctrines, right, but my foundation had been wrong, or, rather, I had had no foundation. If God has really given a revelation to the world, there must be some authority to interpret and guarantee that revelation. Every religious society claims to be a teaching body. What are its credentials? The Anglican claim breaks down hopelessly, for the reasons I have given and a hundred others. The parallel sometimes drawn between the Church of England and the Orthodox (schismatic) Church of Russia, or other Oriental church (excluding, of course, the heretical bodies) is really wholly misleading. The Catholic faith is, not merely by theory, but in living energy, the religion of those churches, however separation from the centre of unity has dimmed their light and weakened their witness and tainted them with the local and national spirit which contradicts so completely the spirit of Christ and His Redemption. To appeal to the East is certainly not to gain any support for Anglican isolation or for Anglican methods.

But there is in the world one clear, consistent, unhesitating Witness to the Truth, one Voice that speaks with an utterance

unfaltering, unchanging, divinely strong. The very consistency of the Catholic Church is indeed one of the charges that her enemies bring against her. And in the special authority and privilege bestowed upon St. Peter and his successors there is provided for her children a court of appeal from what is merely local, or provincial, or national, a central and supreme tribunal that lasts from age to age, the living Voice of the Divine Shepherd of souls speaking through His earthly Vicar for the guidance, the warning, the consolation of His children. God's truth cannot live on paper, in Holy Scripture, the writings of the doctors of the Church or the decrees of councils only; if there is no way by which the Holy Ghost is to guide the Church into all truth to-day, the gates of hell have indeed prevailed against her.

So the divine light came in its fulness to yet another soul. I can say with thankfulness that so far had I been blessed before I made my submission that in no point, except of course with regard to the divinely bestowed authority of the Vicar of Christ, has my belief been altered since I was received into the Church. Everything has but become clearer, more harmonious, more satisfying. My one regret is for any disloyalty to grace that may have delayed the light for so many years. And my prayer is that all to whom it was my high privilege to minister may be led, as many have already been, to share the unspeakable peace and rejoice in the glorious liberty of the home life of the Catholic Church.

"Accedite ad Eum et illuminamini: et facies vestrae non confundentur."

J. FABER SCHOLFIELD.

Holy Island, England.

THE CANADIAN NORTHWEST SCHOOL QUESTION.¹

OF CANADA'S more than five millions, some half million are now to be found in the new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, about to celebrate on next "Dominion Day," July 1, their having come into being during the current session of the Canadian Parliament. Longitude 110 divides these two provinces, formed out of the smaller territories of the same names, together with Athabasca and Assiniboia, which now disappear. North latitude 60 divides the new provinces from the further northwest territory. Each of them is about the size of Ontario. Manitoba, lying between it and them, looks small in comparison. Something of the cosmopolitan immigration known

¹ *Vide American Catholic Quarterly Review*, April, 1895, and January, 1898.

to the United States is now becoming familiar to this part of Canada, the most rapidly increasing in population, whose educational future is proportionately, therefore, of such great import. The English are coming, but they are the worst farming settlers of all, as a head of an immigration department declares; he has hopes for the second generation of them. Then there are his best classes of settlers, set so far asunder in Europe, by location, race and religion; these are Swedes and Galician Poles. Most of the latter are Catholics. The Catholics are about one-quarter in all the new Alberta and Saskatchewan.

It is concerning the Catholics and their school rights that there has arisen once more the old spectre of sectarian animosity, hovering over the passions of the multitude, the fears of Rome, the suspicions of anti-clericalism, the visions of secular freedom and progress, all the mingled misunderstanding and injustice which this great matter excites and reveals. And then came the question of the rights of minorities and their privileges, and on the other side the question of provincial rights against the central Ottawa government.

Canada—it is so easy to forget—is a federal union. The provinces have, to speak generally, the power to make their own education laws. And from British Columbia at the extreme west, with its absolutely secular school system, through Alberta and Saskatchewan, with modified separate schools, to Manitoba's partly rejected compromise, and to Ontario's and Quebec's Catholic and non-Catholic schools entirely distinct, and so to the maritime provinces and their accepted compromise of some separation under uniform public control, there are of school systems in the Dominion a great if not charming variety.

With astonishment one read last February Sir Wilfred Laurier, the Prime Minister's, speech establishing the two new provinces and making therein provision for separate schools. For this was the Mr. Laurier who from 1890 to 1896 opposed the Catholic minority's claim in Manitoba to have their separate schools restored. This earlier school fight, the Manitoban, has been in every one's mind during the recent battles, not only because of one late explosive thrown from Winnipeg to Ottawa—whose contents we shall examine later on—but also because the interval has marked out a period, as it were, when racial and creed antagonisms have been latent, until now, when they are renewed, parties and leaders seem to have made volte-face. Those who were for Manitoba's separate schools are against the separate schools of Alberta and Saskatchewan. How is this? How is it that Sir Wilfred Laurier seems now the champion of what he crushed a decade of years ago?

His position, he says, is plain. He stands by the constitution in each case. As already stated, the Canadian provinces have the power to make their school systems, but with this proviso, that they do not transgress the British North America Act of 1867, the Constitution, the Imperial Act, by which the modern Canada began its life, with the eastern and central provinces. Now this act lays down that any educational right enjoyed by a minority by law in any province coming into confederation cannot be taken away. Therefore the Protestant minority in Quebec (the former Lower Canada)—in whose interest this provision was first made—and the Catholic minority in Ontario (the former Upper Canada), since they both had separate schools by law, kept them. Therefore the maritime provinces, which had not such schools by law, lost them.

A few years later (1870) Manitoba came into the confederation. Those who framed the Manitoba act inserted a clause that if separate schools existed by law or *practice* they had the right to be continued. That was all in favor of a Protestant minority then in Manitoba. But the Protestants there became the majority, and in 1890 the Manitoba Legislature abolished separate schools. The upshot of the consequent appeals to the highest judicial court, the Privy Council of England, was that the Manitoba Legislature had the power to abolish at least the State payment made to separate schools and to abolish also the right of the supporters thereof to have their taxes go to separate schools' support. The act, as was held, gave no more to the Catholic—he was the person concerned—than the right to establish his own separate or voluntary schools. The Catholic settler certainly thus had a grievance, having now, for conscience's sake, to pay double school taxes; and he had the right to appeal to the Ottawa federal government for relief. He did appeal. The Conservative government proposed a bill for his relief. The Liberals, under Mr. Laurier, opposed this remedial bill. And Mr. Laurier (became Sir Wilfred) got into power on this opposition policy in 1896. He had maintained that the constitution gave Manitoba no guaranteed right to separate schools, and that the remedial bill was merely *recommended* by the Privy Council, and as a matter of fact could not be enforced in the province. Therefore, "Hands off Manitoba!" That was his cry. The letter of the law was on the Liberal-Laurier side. Yet the men who had framed the Manitoba act had indeed protested they thought they were guaranteeing the minority a right to separate schools. "We [when passing the Manitoba act] certainly intended that the Catholics of Manitoba, or whatever denomination might be in the minority, should have the right to establish and maintain their own schools . . . and be absolutely sure of protection. You see

the words 'or practice' were inserted in the Manitoba act so that the difficulty that arose in New Brunswick, where separate schools actually existed, but were not recognized by the law, should not be repeated in Manitoba." However, the Privy Council gave its interpretation. And Sir Wilfred Laurier can say he had the letter of the law on his side. And that is the question.

Again he declares how he stood for the constitution when in 1889 the Quebec Legislature gave \$400,000 to the Jesuits and \$60,000 to the Protestant Board of Education—the property, as it all was, of the Jesuits, confiscated when Canada passed to the English, but now, a century after, restored. That restitution was within the power of the province of Quebec, and the present Liberal Prime Minister claims he was but consistent in joining with his Conservative predecessor of that day in refusing to overrule the provincial Jesuits' estates act.

But to-day it is otherwise. The Northwest Territories, about to be provinces, have had separate schools by law.

What were the separate school laws of these Territories? In 1870 they had as Territories come under the Canadian constitution, and in 1875 the following was made law:

The minority of ratepayers, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish separate schools therein; and in such latter cases the ratepayers establishing such Protestant and Roman Catholic separate schools shall be liable only to assessment of such rates as they may impose upon themselves in respect thereof.

In these Territories in 1884 and succeeding years certain "ordinances" were passed modifying this separate school law; religious teaching was forbidden before 3 o'clock. However, a board was established of six Protestants and six Catholics, and to the Catholic members was left much of the control of the Catholic schools.

By the 1892 ordinance responsibility and control of educational policy was vested in the government, a result of the movement against clerically controlled schools. The protests to-day of the Archbishop of St. Boniface are directed, as we shall see, against the taking away of rights dating from 1902.

In 1901 a commissioner of education was appointed; and religious teaching was forbidden before 3.30.

So Sir Wilfred Laurier and his government, when bringing in the 1905 autonomy bill forming the new Northwest provinces, found in these Territories separate schools, but not with such practice therein as exists in the separate schools of Ontario and Quebec. Here in the Northwest Territories the only separation in textbooks was the permission of alternative readers in the first two grades. Still a Catholic minority paid its taxes to schools where

Catholic children went to be taught under Catholic teachers. That was the law. Therefore, said the Ottawa government, these Territories fall under the British North America act; they have had separate schools by law, and we have only to continue to them the same. It is an intelligible position. I am within the constitution for the third time, Sir Wilfred Laurier maintained; I am quite consistent.

He proposed then, as follows, the clauses having to do with this minority school matter:

The minority of the ratepayers, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish separate schools and make the necessary assessment and collection of rates therefor.

In such case the ratepayers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic separate schools shall be liable to assessment of such rates as they impose upon themselves in respect thereof.

In the appropriation of public moneys by the Legislature in aid of education and in the distribution of any moneys paid to the government of the provinces, arising from the school fund established by the Dominion Lands Act, there shall be no discrimination between the public schools and the separate schools, and such moneys shall be applied to the support of public and separate schools in equitable shares or proportions.

This proposal, as is seen, copied the wording of the 1875 law. It was withdrawn, and the following was passed:

Nothing in any such law [now to be passed] shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to separate schools which any class of persons have at the date of the passing of this act.

In the appropriation by the Legislature or distribution by the Government of the Province of any money for the support of schools . . . there shall be no discrimination against schools [as] described.

Why were the first proposed clauses withdrawn? Because the Minister of the Interior, Mr. Sifton, resigned. He had been in the Manitoba ministry during their fighting against separate schools. His contention was that the clauses as proposed were so vague that if in the future one of these new provinces were to vote money for a provincial university it could not, if petitioned, refuse voting money for a separate university as well. There were rumors of further resignations in the Cabinet. And the agitation in Toronto especially grew much stronger, of course, against the "trail of the Jesuit" being laid over the Northwest; against the throttling of liberties; against the burdening of generations to come; against the sowing of dissension. The amended clauses passed by a large majority. There was a clear Protestant majority for them, all the members for Nova Scotia (who, a unit for Laurier, are most of them Protestants) voting *pro*, as well as the almost solidly Laurier and Catholic province of Quebec. Ontario divided, its anti-Laurier (not large) Conservative majority voting *con*. The Northwest itself voted in majority *pro*.

What is implied in the clause as passed? In the legal opinion read by the Minister of Justice, Mr. Fitzpatrick:

Under the ordinances [passed, as we said, in the Territories, 1884—1901, and in force at the passing of the Autonomy Bills, establishing the new provinces] no rights or privileges exist with respect to separate schools as contrasted with public schools, except the initial right of effecting the separation.

This right, he goes on to state, carries with it the right of the minority to elect Catholic trustees, who choose Catholic teachers. What applies in all this to a Catholic minority would apply, *ipso facto*, to a Protestant one.

This opinion of the scope of the first draft and the second draft of the clauses and their relation to each other has not passed unchallenged. The Prime Minister of the Northwest, Mr. Haultain, was opposed to the first and to the second also. He maintains there is no sure distinction between them. The first draft gave the 1875 act unmodified by the 1892 ordinances. But it might be so modified, and so might come to mean the everlasting establishing of schools as they are. The second draft gives the 1875 act as modified by 1892; but the modification may be withdrawn, and we may have separate schools forever in the fuller Quebec and Ontario sense—separate training, separate inspection, separate text-books. The Orangemen met and judged that the first draft is even as the second. They noted, after their manner, that the bill was drafted by three Catholic Ministers—the Prime Minister, the Minister of Justice and the Secretary of State, the Hon R. W. Scott. Their grand master, Dr. Sproule, the champion of his society in Parliament, telegraphed that the “amendments proposed as a compromise are fully as objectionable as original clauses.” Dr. Sproule is consistent. He voted against his own Conservative party when it was for the Manitoba Catholic minority, and then helped the Mr. Laurier in opposition that he now combats in office. He may seize on constitutional arguments, but he and his frankly act against le cléricalisme, voilà l’ennemi. So his more able predecessor, the late Mr. Dalton McCarthy, voted in the federal parliament for revising the provincial Quebec legislation in favor of the Jesuits and their estates, while he voted against revising the provincial Manitoba legislation disfavoring the Catholic schools. Both those acts of provinces were legally within provincial rights. Could the former Orange leader have brought himself to-day to vote for the separate school clauses, opposition to which is not within provincial rights? One has a claim thus to say that here absolutely and to ask the question, because Mr. McCarthy in 1894 wanted by federal act to get rid of the separate school clauses in the 1875 Territories act. The suggestion has been made, perhaps not with foundation, that he not only wished to abolish the separate schools, even as modified by 1892, but also feared lest if they existed

"by law" at the moment when the Territories became provinces, such schools could be legally protected by the British North America act. He is acknowledged by all to have been a far-seeing, clear-minded lawyer.

However, be that as it may, we cannot help having a certain sympathy, if not with the Orangemen, yet with the speech of Mr. Fielding, Minister of Finance, formerly Prime Minister of Nova Scotia, who wished men could take this school question out of the lawyers' arena. It is something so intimately touching upon people's feelings, their traditions, their family life, their religion, their contentment as citizens, and, further, there is something so hopeless in trying to make men agree with regard to it, that a statesman will not say have I not the right herein to make my people miserable, but is it not my interest to make them happy? Mr. Fielding himself would wish to see the children of citizens studying and playing together without considering their various religions. But Catholics, as he reflected, are 41 per cent. of the Canadian population; it is politically impossible to act in continual hostility to such a number; were it possible, it would be undesirable, and it would be unjust. A Protestant himself, he appealed to his co-religionists to take things as they are. He spoke of the compromises at which neutral forbearance had arrived in the maritime provinces. In his own city of Halifax, with a population somewhat less than half Catholic, the Catholic and the Protestant children go to different schools, though of course the public school secular law of the province prevails. The Archbishop builds the schools and leases the building to the School Board, who appoint Catholic teachers, many of whom are nuns. The text-books are drawn up by a committee, on which are some Catholic priests, and these books are used by Protestant and Catholic schools alike. Religious teaching can be given only before or after school hours. The Catholic schools have often many religious pictures and statues. The school buildings are surmounted by the cross. All this by custom, by live-and-let-live.

In New Brunswick, in three larger towns, something of the same compromise has been agreed to. In Prince Edward Island, the third maritime province, it obtains in only one school for boys. The Catholics there have asked for an extension of the system, as in the "island's" two neighbors. In country parts throughout these old provinces Catholics are often in settlements apart, as are settlers of other religions. The teacher then is Catholic, and the school question raises no difficulty. The arrangement, such as it is, has no force of law.

In the new provinces the new law sanctions this, and something more. "If Manitoba had had such schools as the bill proposes for

the Northwest"—separate, but under public control, with restriction of hours of religious teaching—"there would have been no Manitoba school question," said (in April, 1905) Mr. Greenway, the former Manitoba Minister who abolished the Catholic schools there. But, by the way, he might have remembered that not now, under his law in Manitoba, have they separation of religious denominations during ordinary school hours, as provided for in the Northwest bills.

However, these compromises or settlements have been alluded to here in order to show what could be done by those who sought peace yet respected the principles (the prejudices even, as they say) of their opponents.

But why, then, it was asked, do we not leave the settlement of this whole school matter to the provinces? Why not "Hands off, Alberta and Saskatchewan?" Well, as far as this is satisfying perhaps I have made the legal answer clear by explaining Sir Wilfred Laurier's varied action and, before him, the action of the Manitoba act framers in 1871, because of what had just happened in New Brunswick. At the risk of wearying readers it is to be repeated that New Brunswick (and the other maritime provinces) had had no separate schools "by law;" therefore the British North America act did not protect the schools the Catholics had there, and the Manitoba Catholic schools found themselves not protected by the letter of the law of the Manitoba act ostensibly framed to protect them.² But in this present case of the Northwest Catholics may say, why should we leave our schools to the local legislature? No court has decided that we at least are not protected by the British North America act declaring that minority schools existing "by law" when a province enters the union shall be therein assured. We had our schools by law. Why should we not, like any other citizens, claim the support of the law, and not be asked to waive our rights merely to allay irrational irritation and suspicion and injustice? And, further, as Burke says, the genuine love of liberty is extremely rare. It is putting no exceptional shame on the Protestant majority in the Northwest if Catholics would rather have the case settled in the federal parliament. They need not charge all the opponents of their schools with being fanatical irreligious bigots, *sectaries*. But allowing that all the opposition comes from

² An intimate friend of the late Dr. Grant's writes—Dr. Grant was principal of Queen's University, the most prominent Presbyterian minister in Canada, and moderate on the Manitoba matter—"I think the late Principal Grant was a good prophet when he said that after the action of the Greenway Government in Manitoba in 1890 the people of the Dominion would never have confidence in provincial governments doing what was right by the minority."

honest enthusiasm for the unity of the nation by bringing up its youth together, or from honest desire for a generous education and efficiency of teaching, together with suitable material surroundings; even allowing all this—and the present writer is far from refusing to admit how much good sense and right feeling there is in it—Catholics know, as everybody else knows, that these education matters touch ideals of life and conduct about which it is impossible to obtain agreement between Catholics and many non-Catholics, and which ideals imply opportunities therefore for dealing with life and conduct in relation to religion and under direction from Catholics, throughout the earlier times of education at least. To have sympathy for that with which you do not agree is often noble, but it is hard; it is much harder to understand that other side sufficiently to have any sympathy with it. We err in a thousand ways negatively, when we do not err positively, if we attempt to legislate for our neighbor. Take the religious census of the population of these Northwest Territories in 1901, and what would be the probable chances of the Catholics? To-day that population is four times as great, but the proportion of Catholics is not higher—about one-quarter of the present half million. Join the Anglicans, and you will still be 50,000 short of a half. And the Anglicans are not even as sure allies in Canada as they have been in England; and that is not very sure. Their late respected Archbishop of Rupert's Land, Dr. Machray, did not indeed favor Manitoba's resistance to the remedial bill, and the organ of his Church wrote that "Roman Catholics want, and rightly so, to surround their children all day long and every day with an atmosphere of religion. They want not merely to impress upon their young people's minds certain important dogmas, but so to fill them with a sense of close relationship that ought to exist between these dogmas and the conduct of their everyday lives that they will grow up Christian men and women." It is well said. And yet it must be noted that the Anglican ministers assembled this year in the Northwest added one more to the other Protestant ministerial memorials in favor of leaving the school matters to the new local governments. Would the Catholics have then got more than they got in Manitoba, which is far from being what the Anglican paper just quoted suggested, and is merely the permission to have Catholic teachers in minority schools if that is the desire of a certain number? The Northwest now has to give by federal law not only Catholic teachers, but Catholic schools. And really, as cannot be too often recalled for the moment, the Manitoba settlement was not encouraging for those who might be tempted to yield to the appeal, "trust the provinces." What has happened in Manitoba since 1896? The burden has been

great on those who, as in the United States, have there to support two sets of schools. Much sympathy has been expressed for the suffering minority, but

I never yet did hear
That the bruised heart was pierced through the ear.

We are very sorry, but we cannot help you, has been the refrain of the answer given by the powerful, as each fresh effort has been made to get better terms for the weak. In March, 1900, a Catholic appeal to the School Board stated that in Winnipeg 700 Catholic children were attending the separate schools, and 200 of them not attending any schools at all; and that the separate schools, spite of every effort, were heavily in debt. The separate school teachers had now certificates, they said, from the provincial department of education, and the Catholics offered to accept the public school system of inspection. They asked the Board to retain the Catholic teachers, to pay them and to bear the expense of equipping the schools, very much what is given by custom in larger towns in the maritime provinces and by law in Alberta and Saskatchewan. But always negotiations have broken against the clause of the Laurier-Greenway settlement, "No separation of pupils by religious denominations shall take place during the secular school work." All the facts have been recalled in the press hostile to the Laurier Northwest proposal for separate schools, and hence it may be inferred that in it there is a sign of how this press would urge the new provinces to act if they were left free. And the Catholic minimum did demand this very separation during school hours. Mgr. Sbaretti, the Papal Delegate, this year asked the Manitoba Ministry—of the opposite party, too, to the Ministry that took the Manitoba separate schools away—to give concessions; this separation of pupils was among them. His request was rejected—in circumstances to be mentioned later, that revealed the depths of feelings, passions, hopes and fears roused by debating over the schools.

To sum up, the new provinces are not being left free to deal with education as the first law guarantees they shall be, because the law adds subject to the British North America act, the which gives minority schools, if they are already existing by law. Further, the examples before them do not encourage the Catholics to trust their non-Catholic fellow-citizens who may honestly or fanatically disapprove of Catholic education or misunderstand it. And this, though so much may be said for efficiency gained by public inspection and control.

And now, as a further revelation, it is no wonder that on their side the non-Catholics, or secularists, fight, for they have good reason to know there is strong Catholic opposition to any compro-

mise at all and to any public control. Again, we connect the Manitoba question with the present one. What can be stronger than these words of the Archbishop of St. Boniface (Winnipeg) with regard to the earlier and later questions within his ecclesiastical province? And what can be more like in tone?

No Catholic can approve of these schools unless he wishes to cut himself off from the Church. . . . We wish [*? voulons*: which is much more] (1) control of our schools; (2) Catholic school districts everywhere; (3) Catholic histories and reading books; (4) Catholic inspection; (5) competent Catholic teachers instructed by us; (6) our taxes and exemption from taxes for other schools.

The Remedial Bill [of the Conservatives, opposed by Mr. Laurier, 1896, and defeated through his French Canadian Catholic following] gave us all that in principle. . . . But what has been given us in its place? Not one of our sacred rights, not a single one.

In those words Archbishop Langevin judges the Manitoba "settlement." And in the same number of this REVIEW (January, 1898) there may be read Pope Leo XIII., who, if he did not say what the Archbishop said, yet declared that "the law made to remedy the evil is defective, imperfect, insufficient." The Pope continued, however: "As to what regards particularly the Catholics of Manitoba, we have confidence that, God helping, they will one day obtain full satisfaction. This confidence is founded, above all, on the goodness of their cause; next, on the justice and wisdom of those who govern, and lastly, on the good-will of all upright Canadians. In the meantime, until they succeed in their claims, let them not refuse [this] partial satisfaction. Under your authority"—he is writing to the Canadian Bishops after receiving Cardinal (then Mgr.) Merry del Val's report—"and with the help of those who direct your schools, a complete course of studies ought to be carefully devised. Special care should be taken that those who are employed as teachers should be abundantly provided with all the qualities, natural and acquired, which are requisite for their profession. It is only right that Catholic schools, both in their educational methods and in the standard of their teaching, should be able to compete with the best. *From the standpoint of intellectual culture and progress the design conceived by the Canadian provinces for the development of public instruction, for the raising of the standard of education and making it daily more refined and perfect, must assuredly be allowed to be honorable and noble.*"

The Archbishop of St. Boniface, as has just been said, now uses with regard to Alberta and Saskatchewan almost the words that he used ten years ago with regard to Manitoba:

We learn with unspeakable sorrow that the educational clause destined to be inserted in the Autonomy Bill of the two new Provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan will not restore us to the position we held in 1875, when the Northwest Territories were organized in virtue of the British North America Act, but that this clause will conserve the spoliation of our school rights by the ordinance of 1892, and will sanction all ordinances passed up to 1901.

This is for us a cruel disappointment and a source of great sadness and grave anxiety for the future. The spoliation of 1892 will thus be definitely confirmed and conserved, and we lose all hope of recovering our rights, we who expected this act of justice and high wisdom, as well as of true patriotism, from our rulers at Ottawa.

In 1873 we had the same school rights as the Protestant minority of Quebec and the Catholic minority of Ontario; and these rights, shamefully violated in spite of the Constitution, as the lamented Archbishop Taché so well proved in his memorial of 1904³ ["A Page of the History of the Schools of Manitoba During Seventy-five Years," 1893], will not be recognized and restored to us, as we had reason to expect, by Parliament, which had power to do so.

Catholics who express satisfaction at such a state of things betray not only unpardonable ignorance of Catholic educational principles, but also a lack of understanding of the painful position in which we are (*sic*) placed since 1892—ostracized, as we truly are, in the Territories.

Wherefore, reverend and dear brethren, we deem it our duty to raise our voice in protest against this ignoring of school rights, which the Constitution of our country gives us. Our rights are as sacred and as certain to-day as they were in 1875. And if some opportunists were [to be] tempted to ask us to be silent for the sake of peace, or because it is impossible now to recover our rights, we would answer: "There can be no peace except with justice." There can be no prescription against right. No question of principle is truly settled except when it is settled according to justice and equity.

Our cause is that of justice and peace, because it is the cause of conscience and truth; and truth, like God, never dies.⁴

³ Archbishop Taché died in 1894.

⁴ Dr. Bryce, a Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada, formerly Moderator of the Presbyterian General Assembly, and head of the faculty of science in the University of Manitoba (consisting of colleges of various religions, including Catholic), declared on May 29 to a *Toronto Globe* reviewer that "there is no discontent in the Northwest over the educational settlement according to the second draft of the autonomy bills: the almost universal testimony is that the Territories want the continuation of their present school system," as guaranteed by these bills. "That has been formally expressed by the unanimous election of Hon. Mr. Oliver, of Edmonton. . . . This temper on the part of the western people is, of course, discouraging for the educational doctrinaires, who wish to dominate us with their notions. The only coercion in sight is that of a narrow-minded handful in Toronto, who wish to coerce our western people into an agitation that is distasteful to them. There is a feeling of resentment against the interference of these Toronto dictators. . . . A public school system—pure and simple—is impossible in Canada. In Winnipeg city to-day, fifteen years after the passing of our (Manitoba) act, we have the Roman Catholics still dissatisfied. They are paying taxes towards the support of the public schools, and are maintaining parochial schools of their own. This is undesirable. Then, sixty or seventy of their schools in country places, nominally public schools, are, it is declared (but this is denied by the Manitoban Minister, Mr. Rogers), being conducted as separate schools. This again is undesirable. It is because I am well acquainted with the Territories and their school system that I am confident that their method is the best yet devised for approximating to uniformity, and yet giving a certain diversity to allow for religious instruction and religious sentiment."

A recent letter from the Northwest itself expresses some Liberal Protestant feeling thence, if not Catholic also:

"Regarding the school question, as you are aware, I am in favor of national schools, and think the Catholics hide their light under a bushel when they persist in keeping to themselves so exclusively in this matter, and consequently are very much misunderstood by some, or rather many Protestants, as to their religion.

"The curious part of the controversy to me is this, that in the west there is practically no controversy, as we are getting exactly what we have had since 1901, which has given satisfaction to both Protestants and Catholics.

The protest could be imagined which the Archbishop would direct against the *Toronto Globe* writer, quoted in the *London Tablet* for March 18, 1905, to the effect that "It will be seen, therefore, that

As long as certain Protestant ministers thought that Sir Wilfred Laurier was treading on his Catholic co-religionists [*? in re Manitoba*] they were of the opinion that he was all right; but as soon as the Prime Minister gives his co-religionists what they are entitled to by the law of the land, they evidently think he is a very bad man. . . . The father of the present school laws in the Territories is the Hon. Frank Oliver, Minister of the Interior, who introduced the bill in the Regina House in 1901, when he represented this district in the Territorial House. . . . All the schools are public schools; all have the same course of study, and all are inspected by the same public school inspector. The word separate school is a misnomer, therefore, when applied to the school system of the Northwest Territories.

"The system works out in this manner. In case a community is settled by Catholics, if a school is established, it is called a public school, and any Protestants in said community can send their children to the same. The last half-hour of each day is or may be given over to religious instruction. In case the Protestants in the community do not desire to send their children to this school, they may, if they wish, build a school of their own, which is then called a 'separate school.' It is a public school, however; has the same course as the Catholic school, and the same inspector, and may have religious instruction from 3.30 to 4, if so desired; but the children need not stay if their parents object. The taxes are levied on those who attend each school; that is, the Catholics pay for their school and the Protestants for theirs. There is no double taxation on either body.

"In case a community is Protestant, the first school established is called the public school; and then if the Catholics do not want to attend it they establish their own school, which is called a 'separate school,' but has the same course and same inspector as 'the Protestant public school,' as stated above.

"You will readily see that the State controls both schools; and they are both public schools, and still not what good Catholics would or can call 'Godless schools.'

"There are over one thousand schools ['Catholic public' and 'Protestant public'] in the Northwest Territories, established since this law came in force in 1901, eleven of which are so-called 'separate schools.' Four of these eleven are in the country districts; two of these are Protestant separate schools and two Catholic separate schools. The remaining seven are established in the towns, and these seven are Catholic separate schools—but all public schools, nevertheless.

"We have lived under this system since 1901, and have been very happy, not knowing that we had a grievance. No kick of any kind was made until Sir Wilfred Laurier, a Catholic, undertook to endorse or establish for all time the public school system that we ourselves made. His great fault in the Conservatives' eyes is that he is a Catholic and in power, and they want power, and do not care how they abuse or misrepresent him, while at the same time their leader introduces a private, not a party, amendment to a bill which, as regards the schools, gives perfect satisfaction to the west.

"If any one has a grievance, it is the Catholics, as it would appear under the British North America Act they are entitled to Church separate schools. But the laity of the Catholic Church in the west like the present system of public schools, as they know that their children in receiving public school instruction are better educated in commercial matters. . . .

"Yes, immigration is very large. There is no school question in the west. "You can use the contents of this letter, but not my name, please, as I am a Government official and have no opinions any more for the public."

there are complaints on both sides, as is likely to be the case under a compromise, but that on the whole no serious grievance exists that could not be satisfactorily ameliorated. The conferring on the provincial authorities of full power over education has not, therefore, led to any serious tyrannies or oppressions."

To be sure, we may admit that the ordinances may be legally done away with. But who can expect that result when the Northwest majority is probably destined to be Protestant? And not even Anglican-Protestant.

There is another revelation to be made, though that is too high a word. It is an allusion to what is such a tug-of-war—honest, if you like; amicable (at least supernaturally)—between the French and the English-speaking Catholics. Mr. Henry Bourassa—the first-rate and able speaker that he is—in parliamentary style, to match the Archbishop's circular letter to the clergy, came out with a protest against the amended Northwest education clause; on religious grounds, indeed, but also on the grounds that French language and tradition had now no chance. And they have little. Who could look without sympathy, if not regret, at the doom that seems awaiting in the Northwest the flocks of these French Oblate Fathers, worthy successors of those French Jesuits of 250 years ago, for whom Central Canada was the wild West? Such is the question we should be inclined to put. If there is any class of Canadians who look upon the destruction of the French language with equanimity, it is English-speaking Canadian Catholics, specially those of Irish descent. I mean the *official* French language. These English-speaking brethren will feel at rest only when French in Canada is like French in Louisiana. Its abolition as an official language in Manitoba they rejoice at. They would never vote for separate schools to teach French in Alberta and Saskatchewan. Both priests and laymen—and these the most religious—readily express their satisfaction with the settlement in Manitoba, not to say the Northwest. It hits the French hard, they allow, but they look at the uncompromising attitude of the Archbishop as partly French, and that dulls their sympathy with his Catholicity; it is indeed partly in the interests of a united Catholicism that they wish for the disappearance of French. This may be a mystery to those who are Europeans. Perhaps it is better understood by all Americans, specially in the country, of the effort made by Herr Cahensly, so enthusiastically supported by the pious and trenchant French-Canadian editor of *La Vérité*, the late Mr. Tardivel. But whether this French-English struggle be understood or not, sympathized with or not, to ignore it would be to make the full view of the Catholic situation in Canada impossible. For all they do not make

a stir, and though there be nothing audible but the steady breathing in strife, yet all the same two bull dogs holding on are in not less grave conflict than are the fussy barkers, the terriers of the sects. Only when the French are hopelessly beaten, as now seemingly in Manitoba, does the English-speaking brother express a certain pitying regard with, "O, well, they lost their chance when they turned to the New England States and placed their million there instead of in Northwest Canada." Very true; and the consequences are hard to bear and harder still the outlook.

What is more surprising still is the persistent attitude of the "English" Catholics towards the French in Quebec province and part of Ontario; there where the French are firmly entrenched—at bay, too often; little wonder—and where it is inconceivable that even for generations to come they can be dislodged. Yet in schools and colleges the English boys and young men learn French but imperfectly, if at all. They simply won't learn it, a Jesuit Father said to me concerning his foolish boys. Signs by, as we say in Ireland, many places go to the French, because tramway conductors have to be bi-lingual, and there is prestige for an orator who can beat another in a language which is not his mother tongue. The Irish Canadians, having lost their own language, sadly grudge the French Canadians theirs and sit chafing at the bi-linguists instead of being up doing like them. The French doubtless feel that they have had to fight for their lives, and will have to fight. They have the suspicions, the doggedness, the aggressiveness often of a minority. But dislodge them from Central Canada, and even from the maritime provinces, where they are increasing faster than others—impossible! They number a third of Canada's population, and though they decrease in proportion to others, they possess the St. Lawrence, Quebec and Montreal, not to say half Ottawa. They have traditions, they are deep rooted in Canadian soil, they have their heart in the country perhaps more than any; they have a literature, a history beyond all comparison more stirring than others can show; they were the pioneers; they have tenacity now and solidity, a real national life. No apology is needed for trying to impress on all readers of ecclesiastical Canada the intensity of the French feeling and the factor it must be in every just judgment passed on such questions as Canadian Catholic education.

Have we, then, seen the last separate school question in Canada? Archbishop Langevin gave us an answer for the Northwest. And it is difficult to ignore those who will not be ignored. Will the French Catholics of New Brunswick, if they come to be a majority in that province, or even a strong, united minority—they have made extraordinary strides out of obscurity in a generation—will they

live under the present New Brunswick school law? On the other hand, the secularists in Ontario, and the coming French secularists in Quebec, will they not strive to break these rights of separate schools in their provinces? Passionate planning to have one's own way in this matter soon gets to work when any chance is given to rouse fear of Church in State. And of this there was a fine example over the very matter in hand. It makes a story in itself, but it is most suggestive with regard to the modern mistrust of clerical influence, the latent hostility to Rome, the clashing of older and newer ideas of public recognition of religion in the school as in the Senate.

Not that Mgr. Sbaretti, the Papal Delegate, had schemes or plans that were terrifying, but some there were who readily feared he had and others exploited the fears; and even Catholic priests were far from unanimously feeling comfortable about the churchman's discretion or being pleased with his interference. His action was simply as follows: Once more it connects the Manitoba question of ten years ago with to-day. Making himself the not unnatural spokesman of the Catholic minority in Manitoba, he asked a member of the government in that province to come to see him in Ottawa. This Mr. Campbell was in the capital on a mission to try to induce the federal government to extend Manitoba's boundaries up to Hudson's Bay, an extension that is being considered also by Ontario, which fact it is essential here to keep in mind, for it was a reason for not hastily deciding to grant the wish of Manitoba. Mgr. Sbaretti's object was to get better terms if possible for the Manitoba Catholics. He told his provincial ministerial acquaintance that it would be "politically expedient" for his government to do something in this direction, seeing that the Catholics in the territory that Manitoba covets have objected to becoming part of that province and subject to its school law. As was told us long ago by Mr. Edward Blake (when he was in the Canadian Parliament), proposing settlers had asked for assurances about what they thought school freedom before being willing to come into the Canadian Northwest. Mr. Campbell asked the Delegate to give him in writing what the Catholics would accept as a minimum of change in the school law. The writing was given; it named not only religious instruction and Catholic teachers, but also separation of pupils by denominations; all this, if there were fifteen Catholic pupils in a village or thirty in a town whose parents or guardians should petition for the change. Mgr. Sbaretti's requests were not granted. So much for the facts.

Then appeared a long sensational article by a Mr. Rogers, another member of the Manitoba government. To judge by his con-

duct, he merits the one Shakespearean adjective for a politician. The world understood him to say that Mgr. Sbaretti sent for him and Mr. Campbell on February 20, on which day they met the Delegate, who offered as his price for being bought off the changes in the Manitoba act above mentioned ; otherwise Sir Wilfred Laurier, who, of course, had consulted the lieutenant of the Pope about the matter, would punish the too Protestant Manitoba by refusing extension of her boundary. Mr. Rogers was firm against Italian wiles, as he takes care to let us understand, and on February 20 they left the Papal Delegate, who then communicated with *his* delegate, the Prime Minister ; and the next day, February 21, Sir Wilfred's speech was made, and the honest Manitoba Ministers went home glorious, but defeated. "A natural, though corrupt Love, of the *Lie* it self" seems to have possessed Conservative-scheming Mr. Rogers. For sooner or later he would have to be found out. However, he thought to raise the waters, as he certainly did. The ringing of the changes on their poor half dozen notes, "insolent and insidious," "insidious and insolent," "insolent and atrocious," "atrocious and insolent," "atrocious, insolent and ungrateful," "ungrateful, insolent and atrocious"—all about "the Popish aggression"—in the England of half a century back ; all "the old, old ding-dong which has scared town and country this weary time" was echoed in belated Toronto. It is living in a fool's paradise, said the once Laurier-supporting *Globe*, not to recognize that separate schools are just what the country will not have. It is monstrous, said the opposition leader, that the head of the government gets his orders from the Pope. Send the Pope's legate packing, cried the rank and file. Many Catholics would have given him his papers.

At last Mgr. Sbaretti made a statement : (a) He never saw this Mr. Rogers at all. (b) He did say it would be "politically expedient" for Manitoba to give school concessions ; else the other Northwest Catholics, of whom he was the representative, would not be willing to become Manitobans. (c) He had no communication with the government. (d) Lastly, to crown all, the interview with Mr. Campbell took place, not on February 20, but on February 23, two days *after* the speech of the Prime Minister, on February 21, refusing the extended boundary to Manitoba ; which ministerial speech, Mr. Rogers said, was the result of the previous rebuff he gave Mgr. Sbaretti at the interview which never took place, as far as he was concerned, at all, which did take place with Mr. Campbell *after* Manitoba's fate was decided.

But whoever thinks "l'affaire Sbaretti" has not excited fruitful anti-Popery knows little of the latent hostility to clerical influence and of the rankling suspicion that remains and of the determination to fight for claims such as the claims of the Liberals are to be

at the coming elections in England: (1) Public control, (2) no religion taught, (3) no questions raised of the teacher's belief. Men are going to prison in England for these claims. Cheap heroes some say, but we shall doubtless see at the elections that their going to prison, if it pays them, pays also their party and their cause. Theirs is a popular cause in many a country, and its popularity gains. We Catholics may think it will ruin itself; that it is ruining itself by its own results here, for instance, in America; but it has a long course to run. Who will deny it? And it behooves us to see what are the weaknesses that we ourselves show and have shown. The words quoted above from Leo XIII. hint plainly that if we have cared for the efficiency of our schools, yet we have not cared enough. Look at the "Church" [Anglican] schools in England. And how many of them fell when inspected? How many Catholic schools there despaired, before 1902, of keeping up to the standard for health and comfort of pupils, for light, air and warmth? In France do we not listen constantly to sneering by good priests, or witness their shoulder shrugging at the unnecessary and unseemly excellence or splendor of the republic's school and college buildings? These things ought ye to have done and not to have left the others undone applies all round. And because we think secular schools cannot do what is most essential, it is very absurd to talk therefore about their learning being "so called," when it may be excellent learning, and when there may be a question of such and such branches of study which without expensive equipment are an impossibility.

To combine public control with liberty of soul and mind is the noble ideal which is before us. We are living, in the United States, amidst those who have done among the incoming masses a most marvelous work by the instrument of the public schools. We should never shut our minds to the fact that those who are the most illiterate are so often Catholics. They may not be debased—far from it—they may not be ignorant in very many respects; but they are helpless without instruction in these days—helpless at least to rise. We should never cry up popular instruction as a need, and also decry our neighbors who have done more for it than have many of our brethren. Ruskin had much good sense in his wish never to teach a child how to read at all until he could be sure what the child was going to read. And happier in this world and in the next is the lot of many a peasant girl as ignorant of reading as was Jeanne d'Arc. Still, as we all honestly know, these humors and dallyings with the olden time are not the business in hand. And when we return to Canada, if we do find that the *collèges* of Quebec turn out men who become bilingual orates, we find also that their

Catholic province is the most illiterate. Let us frankly say, do we think this desirable or do we not? Many a time, said a Jesuit rector to me, I have warned our people of the evil day coming, when without doubt education will be taken from the clergy; and it will be on the plea of insufficiency, a plea not specious, he maintained (as our polemics say it was in Manitoba), but a plea well grounded and justifiable. Nearly 39 per cent. of the teachers in the province of Quebec are religious; they need not be certificated. Nor in Ontario need the smaller religious number there be so—as yet. A decision is pending which will probably enforce certificates there on religious teachers as on others. And at least one Ontario Bishop has himself enforced them by his own authority. But we have been faulty, if not in soundness of learning, yet in worldly wisdom, by seeming to be unwilling that the world shall have a test of our teachers' good preparation and fitness. Explain it how we may, separate schools in Canada on the whole lack prestige. And the explanation is not far removed when we hear the same mouth boldly declaring that these schools are equal to any, and then whispering that we do the best we can in our poverty. Is poverty always present of necessity? But in any case, on which plea rests our case? We are convinced, certainly, that Herbert Spencer did see into the life of things when, at the end, he wrote:

"That right guidance may be furnished by a system of natural ethics is a belief naturally followed by the corollary that it needs only to develop such a system, and the required self-control will result. But calm contemplation of men's natures and doings dissipate this corollary. So long as it will hold together, a society wicked in the extreme may be formed of men that in keenness of intellect rank with Mephistopheles, and conversely, though its members are stupid and unprogressive, a society may be full of happiness if its members are scrupulously regardful of one another's claims and actively sympathetic. This proposition, though a truism, is little regarded.

"Everywhere the cry is: Educate! Educate! Educate! Everywhere⁵ the belief is that by such culture as schools furnish children, and therefore adults, can be moulded into the desired shapes. It is assumed that when men are taught what is right they will do what is right; that a proposition intellectually accepted will be morally operated. And yet this conviction, contradicted by every-day experience, is at variance with an every-day axiom, the axiom that each faculty is strengthened by the exercise of it. Were it fully understood that the emotions were the masters, and the intellect the servants, it would be seen that little can be done by improving the

⁵ "Bate, I beeseech you, Mother Church."

servants while the master remains unimproved. Improving the servants does but give the masters more power of achieving their ends. But I must limit myself to the issue implied above—denying the commonly supposed connection between intellectual culture and moral improvements, and giving evidence that a society is not benefited but injured by artificially increasing intelligence without regard to character.”

We see in those words a valuable result of positive study underpinning the faith we have been brought up in *a priori*. But then, all the more, we must have that divine discontent with imperfection in our methods whenever we fall short of the ideals of Pope Leo. And where is that not so in this imperfect world? It is certainly so in Canada.

Yet let us say a good word for ourselves in all this business, and especially for our French brethren of Quebec. They did not deny to their Protestant minority schools according to the Protestant mind. They themselves would not come into the Confederation until they had schools guaranteed according to their Catholic mind. Their position is an ever present obstacle in the path of those who would abolish Catholic separate schools in Protestant Ontario. The contrast would be too striking with the Protestant separate schools ungrudged in Catholic Quebec. Even though it is but fair to add that the Ontario minority schools are secular, and the Quebec majority schools are frankly Catholic. Still, to harp on this distinction is but pedantry, as long as your Catholic minority will no more go to a secular school than will your Protestant minority go to a school that is Catholic. The distinction is honestly felt, however, by many non-Catholics and as often ignored by Catholics, whose argument therefore never touches those who ignore our premises that a secular school is as un-Catholic as a Catholic school is un-Protestant. And it were to be wished that we thought of Newman's saying: “Most arguments are useless, because people don't agree about the premises.”

Historically, nevertheless, we have no bad record in Canada. Before Confederation (1867) it was Sir A. T. Galt, a Protestant leader in Quebec, who said (October, 1864): “It was clear that in confiding the general subject of education to the local legislatures it was absolutely necessary it should be accompanied with such restrictions as would prevent injustice in any respect from being done to the minority.” And he continued—his concluding words below being now a favorite Catholic quotation: “This applied to Lower Canada, but it also applied with equal force to Upper Canada and the other provinces; for in Lower Canada there was a Protestant minority, and in the other provinces a Catholic minority.

. . . . There could be no greater injustice to a population than to compel them to have their children educated in a manner contrary to their own religious belief." This promised well, and Sir John Rose could add to his fellow-politician's words that we, the English Protestant minority of Lower Canada, cannot forget that whatever right of separate education we have was accorded to us in the most unrestricted way before the union of the provinces, when we were in a minority and entirely in the hands of the French population. We cannot forget that in no way was there any attempt to prevent us educating our children in the manner we saw fit and deemed best; and I would be untrue to what is just if I forgot to state that the distribution of State funds for educational purposes was made in such a way as to cause no complaint on the part of the minority."

The result of the conflicting school interests and the needful safeguarding was that in the British North America act the clause 93 (often already referred to here) was inserted, guaranteeing that though "*in and for each province the Legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education,*" yet that that is subject to the condition that "*nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools, which any class of persons have by law in the province at the union.*" It seems impossible rightly to hold that that applies only to Quebec and Ontario and not to new provinces. Lord Carnarvon in 1866 gave his opinion: "The object of this clause is to secure to the religious minority of one province the same rights, privileges and protection which the religious minority of another province may enjoy. The Roman Catholics of Upper Canada [Ontario] and the Roman Catholic minority of the maritime provinces will thus stand on a footing of equality." That word of promise was kept by others to the ear only.

Things have worked out in such a way that, whatever be the instances of Catholic or French intolerance, we have repeated assurances that they are the exception, not the rule. A member of the Quebec Cabinet, Mr. Weir, spoke lately in Montreal: "I, being the son of a Scotch father and a Scotch mother, I, a Protestant, have always in this province seen not only our rights but our remotest wishes respected. I challenge any Protestant to say that he has ever been ill-treated. And therefore, when in the province of Ontario we see politicians and bigots appealing to racial and religious prejudices in order to deprive the minority of the rights to which they are constitutionally and logically entitled, it is our imperious duty to cry shame and to stigmatize them." "The English-speaking Protestants," wrote a Quebec lawyer (*Toronto Globe*,

April 12, in a letter "Let us have peace"), "who live among the French Canadians and are unblinded by the prejudices of race or creed, which unfortunately affect the judgment of some individual members of almost all communities, are compelled to blush, nay, to hang our heads in very shame for the violent and unjust appeals to racial and religious passions and prejudices, especially in the West, because of the very reasonable demands made on behalf of other minorities elsewhere. I could not, if I would, claim an utter absence of fanaticism for the entire population of Quebec, but I can and do most positively and most conscientiously aver that there is a general freedom on the part of the best element of the French Canadian population from a desire to do anything short of justice to their fellow-countrymen of other races and creeds. It is but simple fairness on my part to go further and to show, from a very few out of many illustrations of the fact which might be cited, that they are a generous as well as a just and chivalrous people."

A Protestant constituency in Toronto certainly elects a Catholic, Mr. A. Macdonnell. It is not quite fair, then, to say of Toronto Protestantism that it is still in the Belfast Age. But there are facts which may be recalled, when the French Catholics are being called bigots, by the *Toronto Evening Telegram*:

ONTARIO.			
	Population.	No. M. P.'s entitled.	Actual No. M. P.'s.
Protestants	1,800,000	72	79
Catholics	370,000	14	7

So, in the Dominion Parliament, Catholics by proportion are entitled to 87 members; they have 72. And in the Provincial Parliament of Quebec Protestants by proportion are entitled to 8 members; they have 12.

The lawyer just quoted, Mr. E. T. D. Chambers, gives as instances of generosity: (a) That the Bar Association of the district of Quebec, which has only some fifteen English-speaking practitioners at present, out of a total membership of nearly 150, nevertheless elects alternately an English-speaking and a French-speaking bâtonnier; (b) that the English-speaking population of the city of Quebec—English, Scotch and Irish combined—numbers slightly over 10,000 out of a total of about 75,000. Yet the electors return nine English-speaking aldermen to the Council out of a total of thirty, or nearly one-third, although the English-speaking population is only one-seventh of the whole; (c) that for ten years the writer sat in the City Council of Quebec occupying one of the seats for St. Louis Ward, where the French vote far exceeds that of the English-speaking electors. Though twice opposed by French-Canadian candidates, he was never defeated, because of the general

understanding among the majority of the French Canadians of the ward that the English-speaking ratepayers, while in minority, were entitled to one of the seats.

"Is it any wonder," he concludes, "that we who live in the heart of this generous population should complain of the manner in which it is misrepresented and misconstrued by some of your Toronto and other western contemporaries?"

It must, I think, therefore be granted that in French Quebec a just spirit has prevailed. Even the hostile critic in the April *Queen's* [University] *Quarterly* (Kingston, Ont.), Professor James Cappon, recalls that when Quebec (though then the more populous) united with Ontario it agreed to equal representation; but that when Ontario became the more populous, Ontario called for representation by population. The French have words for this sort of thing, *déloyal*, *de mauvaise foi* and *la force prime le droit*. For the last, any way, we have *Might is right*—I fear with a tone in it less condemnatory.

Have I shown plainly by these concluding remarks that the French Canadians, with their experience as French and as Catholics, have been safeguarders of justice in voting for a federal guarantee for separate schools in the new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan?

Be it repeated, anyway, that they had with them finally a Protestant majority. We acknowledge Alberta and Saskatchewan's right to separate schools—such as they are—said the new Minister of the Interior, Mr. Frank Oliver, appointed instead of Mr. Sifton, resigned, but himself another Northwest Protestant and M. P. for Edmonton, Alberta's capital. I am no lover of separate schools, he answered to his Orange co-religionists' petition. But we are not *imposing* such schools, though you express it so; we are simply continuing a legal right. *Esto perpetuum*.

W. F. P. STOCKLEY.

Halifax, N. S.

ANCIENT COMMERCE OF THE PHŒNICIANS IN THE
MEDITERRANEAN.—PART II.

I.

IN A former article under the above title we described how all Phœnician merchants were driven from the Ægæan sea about B. C. 1327 by the people sometimes termed "Pelasgians," which compelled them to seek new markets in the west. Dr. Curtius says: "The Phœnicians had discovered the pole-star; the Phrygo-pelasgians [*i. e.*, "Mycenæans"] chose a brighter constellation, the Great Bear, but if they had not the same accuracy in their observations as their masters, they became in all else their disciples and successful rivals. They thus succeeded in driving them completely from their seas; hence it comes that so few traces of Phœnician rule are found on the shores of the Ionian Sea."¹ In the legend of Danaos building a ship and sailing over seas, Greek tradition seems to point to Danaans² as the earliest seafarers of Greece, of whom they had any recollection. The fact that ships and scenes of the sea do not figure at all in their art representations seems to prove that in the beginning, at least, the authors of the "Mycenæan art" were not seafarers.³ This is confirmed by Thucydides (1, 2), who says that in pre-Homeric times, owing to the constant migrations of the peoples in Hellas, there was no maritime commerce; every one carried arms for want of walled cities and safe roads (*ib.* ch. 6), to defend them against attacks from the sea; and they were content with bare subsistence. The Carians and Phœnicians, who were previously masters of the islands, "were pirates," and were driven from the Ægæan by Minos, King of Crete (ch. 4).

"For the Greeks of old, . . . when they began to have more intercourse with one another by sea, took to piracy for the sake of gain, . . . and plundered those who dwelt in unwalled towns and villages" (ch. 5). Once established along the deeply indented coasts of Greece, on the shores of a sea so studded with islands that one could traverse it without ever losing sight of land, the "Mycenæan" peoples naturally took to the new element. Commerce there must have been from the beginning, as tribe bartered with its

¹ "Griech. Geschichte," I., p. 37. Greek history proper dates from the first Olympiad (776 B. C.).

² Among the vassals of Tahutmes III. depicted in the temple at Karmak are "peoples of the isles of the Taanau," generally identified with the "Danaans" of Homer (*v.* II. 2, 487).

³ Cf. "The Mycenæan Age," by Dr. Chr. Tsountas (1897), p. 333.

neighbor tribe; while the products of distant lands were brought to them by the Phœnicians. Later on, when "Mycenæan" art developed, the store of gold and treasure which they possessed required exchangeable values which their soil alone could not produce. Commerce in slaves, or piracy, must have been reckoned among their resources, and they found a ready market among the Phœnicians.

"Later than the Danaans, the Achæans came down into the Peloponnesus, and by their superior vigor and prowess prevailed over the older stock. . . . About 1500 B. C. the Achæans had made themselves masters of Mycenæ, and imposed upon it their own Kings. We have no tradition of any struggle in connection with this dynastic revolution, and it appears probable that the Achæans did not expel the older stock."⁴ They planted colonies in Rhodes, Caria, Celesia, founded cities in Cyprus, and in Egypt there is evidence of actual settlements. From the "Mycenæan" treasures we know they must have obtained in abundance the copper of Cyprus, the gold of Asia Minor, the ivory of Africa, even the amber of the Baltic. Probably the Achæans were chiefly engaged in the coasting trade of the Ægæan, and foreign products were brought to them by the Phœnicians⁵ (Ezekiel xxvii., 3).

The connection between the Ægæan isles and Egypt⁶ is shown by Phœnician, Cypriot and Ægæan pottery discovered at Kahun by Professor Petrie dating from 1100 B. C., and "Mycenæan" vases at Gurob, of dates ranging from 1400-1100 B. C. Again, at Mycenæ and Ialysos in Rhodes, Egyptian vases were found inscribed with the name of Amen-hotep III., of the fourteenth century B. C. This traffic was originally in the hands of the Phœnicians, but the Achæans, who now became masters of the Ægæan, in course of time obtained control also of the traffic with Egypt.

II.

Such were the beginnings of Greek commerce, and of Greek colonization, which played such a large part in their history after-

⁴ "The Mycenaean Age" (Tsountas), pp. 343, 345. "Achaeans" and "Danaans" are the ethnic names for the Greeks in Homer, and in Homeric times they occupied the chief sites of the "Mycenaean" culture. Greece is called "the land of Achaea" (Il. 1, 254).

⁵ "On the tomb-frescoes of Thebes (Egypt) we see pictured in four groups the tributaries of Tahutmes III. bringing their gifts to that great conqueror; among them . . . are 'the princes of the land of Keftu (Phœnicia) and of the islands in the great sea.' And the tribute in their hands includes vases of distinct Mycenaean style." Tsountas, *ibid.*, p. 319.

⁶ This connection appears in the Homeric poems, which treat of Achæan times. In their whole horizon there is but one great foreign monarchy, Egypt, and its capital, Thebes, is cited as the highest type of wealth and warlike power.

wards. The Phœnicians, as we saw, had obtained a new "sphere of influence" in the western Mediterranean. Strabo (I., 48) dates their settlements beyond the Pillars of Hercules soon after the Trojan war, in the time, that is, of Tyre's first expansion. Pliny (N. H. 3, 3) said of Spain: "Nearly all Spain is rich in metals, lead, iron, copper, silver, gold; Eastern Spain in mica-stone, Andalusia in cinnabar. There are also marble quarries." From Tartessus, beyond the straits, they obtained tin, oil, wine and cheese; the wool of the sheep from its fineness was the best for tapestry and weaving, for which arts the Phœnicians were famous. These seas teemed with the tunny and sardine. From Gadir to Tyre communication soon became as frequent and regular as between Tyre and Cyprus. They dotted their routes with factories, which served as ports of call for their ships and warehouses for their merchandise.

The opposite coast of Africa furnished precious wares in abundance—ivory, rare woods, spices and precious metals—which the Tyrian craftsmen wrought into beautiful works of art or bartered to the "Mycenæan" artists of the Ægæan. Utica was founded about 1158 B. C., and near it rose the towns of Hippo, Hadrumetum and Leptis. The district Emporia, on the Lesser Syrtis, was named from its many Phœnician trading towns. The semitic populations were thickly scattered over all this region, but we cannot distinguish generally Phœnician colonies, Carthaginian foundations and native (Libyan) settlements, that had become Punic. Ophelas (Strabo xvii., 826) may exaggerate when he speaks of 300 cities on the Mauretanian coast beyond Gibraltar, but the colonists and the Carthaginians after them stamped West Africa with a thoroughly Phœnician character, and their language was dominant, at least in the cities, far beyond the limits of their nationality, just as was the case with Latin and Arabic in later times. Soon the Phœnicians ventured yet further on the ocean and obtained tin from the mines of Northwest Spain or the richer deposits of Cornwall and the Scilly Isles (Cassiterides). Probably they first visited Britain about 1100 B. C., when Tyre became the chief city of Phœnicia. The most flourishing period of Tyrian commerce may be placed between the reign of Hiram (1028 B. C.) and the internal troubles which resulted in the rebuilding of Carthage (814 B. C.), during which era the fortunes of Tyre were closely connected with those of the kingdom of Judah and Israel. But partly perhaps from the best of national character and partly from their circumstances, the Phœnician cities never attained to political greatness. There never was a common bond which brought the different cities under one rule; and even common dangers did not induce them to do more than conform to a very loose confederation. But the enterprise of their navigators

had built up for them and their great offshoot, Carthage, a sea power which gave them the command of the Mediterranean west of Italy and Sicily. Their wealth, however, had roused the cupidity of Eastern nations. When they became supreme on land Assyria, Egypt, Babylon and Persia tried in turn to get possession of Phœnicia's maritime resources. In 866 B. C. Asshur-nazirpal, King of Assyria, crossed the Euphrates and overran Syria as far as Damascus and Lebanon. The Phœnicians prudently yielded to him and bought off his opposition with costly gifts, so this conquest was merely a nominal one. In 814 B. C. Carthage was rebuilt in Zeugitania by the Syrians, but soon eclipsed the other Punic cities of Africa and engaged in a rivalry of interests with the mother country.⁷

On the death of the Assyrian, Tiglath-pileser, 727 B. C., the whole of Syria again rose in rebellion against his successor, Shalmanasar IV., who hastily crossed the Euphrates to quell it. A revolt of Cyprus against Tyre gave him an easy victory over the Phœnicians, and the Israelites under Hosea were compelled to sue for peace. But Phœnicia's maritime power was now waning. The Phœnician settlers in Sicily, driven back by Greek colonists into Ziz (Panormus), all those on the Spanish and African coasts, continually harassed by the barbarians, all the peoples and settlements, which Tyre, occupied by her struggles against Assyria, could no longer defend, put themselves under the protection of Carthage. The old ethnic name of Pœni, first used on the shores of the Persian Gulf, now resounded over the Mediterranean and Atlantic Ocean, and the Punic empire replaced in the west that of the Phœnician. Towards the end of Asshu-banipal's reign (665 B. C.) Phœnicia had no longer any colony which recognized her authority. Her wealth and commerce were not thereby lessened. She was still the commercial agent of the whole world, for Greece and Carthage, no less than for the craftsmen of Egypt and Assyria. But she had no longer any power left to resist Assyrian aggression. It was only the civil war between Asshur-banipal and his brother in 650 B. C. that enabled Phœnicia to remain independent without a contest.

In 589 Nebu-chadnezzar, after the capture of Jerusalem (Jerem. xxxix.) besieged Tyre, which capitulated at length after thirteen years on favorable terms. Fifty years later Phœnicia came under the rule of the Persians, and through the energy of Hanno the Great, Carthage asserted her independence. Though the Phœnicians were favored subjects of the Persians because of their indis-

⁷ Carthage was founded before 1200 B. C. (Movers, II., pt. 2, p. 137), but had fallen into decay.

pensable fleet, they retained but a shadow of their former greatness. In 332 B. C. Alexander the Great, who had overthrown the Persian Empire, blockaded Tyre by land and sea and captured it after a seven months' seige. The founding of Alexandria, on the Nile, changed the lines of trade and dealt a fatal blow to Phœnician commerce, which now passed into the hands of the Carthaginians and the commercial cities of Greece—Corinth, Argos, Athens. Thus the doom foretold long ago about Tyre by the prophets was fulfilled: "I will make thee like a naked rock; thou shalt be a drying place for nets."⁸ Two small fishing villages, Tsûr and Saida, alone remain to mark the sites of the ancient cities of Tyre and Sidon, once "the mart of the nations," which glorying beyond measure in "the multitude of their merchandise," fondly deemed themselves "full of wisdom and perfect in beauty," and had thought to reign among the stars of heaven.

III.

But the Phœnicians were not merely traders who bartered one product for another. From a very early date the towns of the Phœnician coast were active in various manufactures. Glasswork, for which the sands of Belus gave excellent material, had its chief seat in Sidon. Opaque glass was discovered long ago by the Egyptians. Glass blowing is represented on the tombs of Beni Hassan, and glass vases are depicted on the tombs of the pyramids (4000 B. C.). The Phœnicians, substituting a mineral for a vegetable alkali, obtained transparent glass.⁹ The natrum (subcarbonate of soda) used for making it was an Egyptian product. They made glass of three sorts, (1) a transparent glass, (2) a translucent, colored glass, and (3) an opaque glass, like porcelain. The glass was colored by metallic oxides; blue glass from cobalt, green from copper, brown from manganese, milky white from oxide of tin or phosphate of chalk. It was used for beads and imitations of gems. They cut, ground and engraved glass, and even had the art of introducing gold between two surfaces of the substance.

The twenty-seventh chapter of Ezekiel gives an eloquent description of the riches and vast commerce of the Phœnicians. They were famous for the excellence of their textile fabrics. They obtained wool from the flocks of Sicharia, which were reared by the Nabatæan Arabs. From Egypt they received fine linen—the *byssus* for which Egypt was always famous. Pelusium (near the modern

⁸ Ezek. xxvi., 14. Isaias xxiii. Zach. ix., 4. Movers, II., 3, p. 200.

⁹ The ancients (as, Pliny N. H. 36, 190) wrongly attributed to the Phœnicians the first discovery of glass.

Suez) was the chief seat of its manufacture, and from a corruption of this name is derived the English word "blouse." Raw silk was obtained from the Persian merchants, which was even then bought from China.

The linen and woolen cloths were dyed with the "Tyrian purple," the produce of the famous *murex*. Their richly colored fabrics are often alluded to by Greek and Latin poets,¹⁰ and Ezekiel mentions "the purple of the isles of Elisa (Hellas)" (vv. 7, 16). The Phœnicians used two species of the *murex*, viz., the *brandaris* and *trunculus*, and also the *purpura lapillus*, to obtain their brilliant dyes. The best Tyrian cloths were termed *dibapha*, and for the production of the true Tyrian purple it was necessary that the dye obtained from the *p. lapillus* should be used after that from the *murex* had been applied. The *Murex* alone gave a dye that was firm and reckoned moderately good; but the *Purpura* alone was weak and easily washed out.

The actual tints produced from the shell-fish appeared to have ranged from blue, through violet and purple, to crimson and rose.¹¹ Scarlet could not be obtained except from the cochineal insect. Even for the brighter sorts of crimson some admixture of the cochineal dye was necessary. The violet tint was not generally prized, except in the time of Augustus; redder hues were commonly preferred. A deep crimson was also in request, and seems frequently to be intended when the term "purple" is used. Purple was used from very early times, and purple and blue are mentioned in Exodus (xxv., 4). Blue was the *hyacinthos* of the Greeks, being extracted from indigo, which was an Egyptian and a Persian dye.

As regards their ceramic art, it is difficult at present to distinguish between objects of Phœnician and "Mycenæan" art. The finest Phœnician efforts that we can be certain about resemble either the best Egyptian or the best Greek pottery, such as the clay *amphora* found at Curium. It was probably a very inferior kind of pottery that they in early times exported both inside and outside the Mediterranean—to the Cassiterides (Strabo 3, 5) and the island of Cerné (Arguin), on the west African coast (Periplus, par. 112).

The Phœnicians used bronze and copper to manufacture vessels, arms and other implements. They worked in lead, imported from Spain, and iron to a small extent, chiefly for arms. The sword

¹⁰ Ovid, *Aeschylus* (Suppl. 279-84), *Lucan* (*Pharsalia*, 10, 142). *Odyss.* 15, 417. *Iliad* 6, 295, etc.

¹¹ The names of the chief tints—dark-red, argaman, and dark-blue, *tekheleth*—seem to indicate that this art originated in Babylonia. Among the Jews of Our Lord's time to be clothed "in purple and fine linen" was the sign of greatwealth (Luke xvi., 19).

which Alexander received from the King of Citium, as Plutarch tells us, was doubtless of this metal. Cyprus furnished the iron breast-plates worn by Demetrius Poliorcetes, and in pre-Homeric times it was a Phœnician, Kinyeas, who gave to Agamemnon his breast-plate of steel, gold and tin (*Iliad* xi., 19). That more remains of iron arms and implements have not been found on Phœnician sites is probably owing to the rapid oxydization of iron, which consequently decays and disappears.¹² Hiram, King of Tyre (B. C. 1028), was "skilful to work in gold, and silver, and bronze, and iron (*II. Paral.* ii., 14). Cunningly wrought vases and goblets of silver and gold from Zahi are frequently mentioned among the tribute brought to Tahutmes III. and in Homer.¹³ The Phœnicians also wrought collars, bracelets and other ornaments of lazuli, green-felspar and other precious stones, and made beautiful chairs and tables of cedar, *Kharub* and *meru* wood, inlaid with ivory, silver and other precious stones and metals. "Here was luxury far beyond that of the Egyptians and technical work which could teach them, rather than be taught. The Syrians were their equals, if not their superiors, in taste and skill."

IV.

Egyptian pottery of the predynastic period shows that ship-building was known in the sixth millenium before Christ, and perhaps was known to the Phœnicians when living on the Persian Gulf, before they migrated to their new homes on the shores of the Mediterranean.

Ezekiel describes for us the construction of their ships (xxvii.): "O Tyrus, . . . They have made all thy shipboards of fir trees of Sanir;¹⁴ they have taken cedars of Lebanon to make masts for thee. Of the oaks of Bashan have they made thine oars; the company of the Ashurites have made thy benches of ivory, brought out of the isles of Chittim."¹⁵

"Fine linen with brodered work from Egypt was that which thou spreadest forth to be thy sail; blue and purple from isle of Elishah¹⁶ was that which covered thee.

¹² "Iron, which occurs rarely and for ornaments, in some of the tombs at Enkoml (Cyprus) suddenly superseded bronze for weapons, and its introduction was accompanied, as in the Argæan, by economic, and probably political, changes, which broke up the high civilization of the Mycenaean colonies (about 1100 B. C.) and brought about a return to poverty, isolation and comparative barbarism" (*Encycl. Brit.*). This change was probably due to the "Dorian invasion."

¹³ Cf. Fl. Petrie, "Hist. of Egypt," II. *Iliad* xxiii., 741. Ezek. xxviii., 13.

¹⁴ The name which the Emorites gave to Mt. Hermon.

¹⁵ The Argæan isles, especially Cyprus, where the name appears in Kitlon, a town on the east coast.

¹⁶ Generally referred to the shores of Hellas, especially the Peloponnesus.

"The inhabitants of Sidon and Arvad were thy mariners; thy wise men, O Tyrus, that were in thee were thy pilots.

"The ancients of Gebel and the wise men thereof were in thee thy calkers;¹⁷ all the ships of the sea with their mariners were in thee to occupy thy merchandize."

When the Pharaohs of the eighteenth dynasty kept a war fleet in the Mediterranean the ships were manned by Phœnician sailors. Even in later times Greek observers noted with admiration the exact order kept on board Phœnician ships, the skill with which every corner of space was utilized, the careful disposition of the cargo, the vigilance of the steersmen and their mates (Xenophon, *Oecon.* viii., 11). The earliest known representation of a Phœnician ship occurs in the sculptures of Sargon. All their vessels, from the common round *gaulos* to the great "Tarshish ships"—the "Atlantic liners" of the ancient world—had a speed which the Greeks never rivalled.¹⁸ Scylax (*par.* 112) tells us that merchant ships usually had small life-boats attached to them. Before the end of the sixth century B. C. biremes had been superseded by triremes, *i. e.*, vessels with three tiers of oars.¹⁹ At the prow of the vessels (or at the poop, according to Suidas) stood little figures of a god, probably intended to protect the ships from harm.²⁰ By some they are thought to be statues of the Egyptian dwarf God, Ptah, to whom there was erected a large temple in the city of Memphis.²¹ It is interesting to notice that the men employed in building it were the Fenkhu (Phœnicians), who in a later age built Solomon's temple at Jerusalem.

V.

Besides commerce by sea with Egypt, the Ægean, Africa, Hellas and Spain, the Phœnicians carried on an extensive land trade by means of caravans. As early as the time of Joseph (about 1600 B. C.) we find a "company" of the Midianites on their way from Gilhead with their camels bearing spices, balm and myrrh to Egypt (*Gen.* xxxvii., 28). In *Isaias* (xxi., 13) there is mention of "traveling companies of Dedanim," "the multitude of camels, the drome-

¹⁷ In the time of Solomon the men of Gebel were famous as shipbuilders and seam-calkers (*III. Kings* 5, 18).

¹⁸ The fleet of Xerxes, which sailed from Asia in 481 B. C. to invade Greece, included contingents from Phœnicia, Cyprus, Ionia, Lycia, etc., but the Phœnician sailors were deemed the best (*Hdt.* vii., 44).

¹⁹ *Hdt.* iii., 13. Xenophon, *Oeconom.* par. 8.

²⁰ *Hdt.* iii., 37. Cf. Bochart, *Phaleg.* II., 3; Movers, *Phönizier*, I., p. 383.

²¹ Memphis was also called *Hafkūptah*, "abode of the spirit of Ptah," from which some say the Greek name for Egypt, *Aiguptos*, is derived. The Egyptians themselves called their country *Géml*, "the black land" (*Cham*, in *Scripture*).

daries of Midian and Epha, and men from Saba bringing gold and incense" (Is. lx., 6). Maspéro tells us: "It is not likely that the Phœnician traders went themselves to seek the gold of the Altaï Mountains and the wares of the Ganges; they only brought merchandise from intermediate depôts in Arabia and Chaldæa. At least they had advanced as far as possible on the great inland high-ways and occupied important posts at fords of rivers and mountain passes. Laish, at the source of the Jordan, was a Sidonian colony (Jos. xiii., 6; Judges xviii., 7, 8). Hamath, in the valley of the Orontes, Thapsacus at a ford of the Euphrates, Nisibis near the source of the Tigris were of Phœnician origin. These towns and others not recorded in history were so many depôts where they stored the products of the surrounding country, to be brought in due course to their warehouses at Lebanon."²²

There were two main inland routes from Phœnicia to the east, (1) The first ran to Haran²³ (Ezek. xxvii., 23), whence it branched off northwards to the Chalybes, on the Euxine coast, and eastwards to Carchemish, on the Euphrates, then across Mesopotamia to the Tigris, and so by Nineveh to Babylon and the Persian Gulf. (2) The second led to Laish, whence it branched off through Midian and along the west coast of Arabia to Yumen, and southwards ran through the gorges of Carmel, past Gaza and Ascalon to Mount Sinai and the Egyptian delta.

The corn imported into Phœnicia was produced in the rich Ammonite country. Ivory and ebony came from India to the Persian Gulf and was conveyed by the Dedanites into Palestine and Phœnicia. Thogorma, a district of Armenia, sent thither horses and mules.²⁴

From the Ægean shores (Hebr. *Javan*, Ionia) and the Euxine (Tubal and Moshoch, Gen. x., 2) came slaves²⁵ and bronze implements. From the Jews and Israelites the Phœnicians seem to have got almost all the grain which they needed for their sustenance. The intercourse of Israel with Phœnicia continued to be carried on at all times, and led to the introduction of Baal worship among the Jews (III. Kings, 16). Wheat, honey, oil and balm were exported by the Phœnicians,²⁶ timber, fish and other wares being received in return. Western Palestine was notoriously a land not only of corn, but also of wine, olive oil and honey, and could readily impart of its superfluity to its neighbor in time of need.

²² *Histoire Ancienne*, p. 235.

²³ In cuneiform, Charan.

²⁴ Strabo xi., 14, 9. Herodot. i., 194.

²⁵ Hdt. i., 1. Odyss. xv., 415-484.

²⁶ III. Kings v., 6, 9, 11. Acts xii., 20. Ezra iii., 7. Nehem. xiii., 16. Ezek. xxvii., 17. In the time of Ezekiel it was "wheat of Minnith."

The oaks of Bashan were very abundant and seem to have been preferred by the Phœnicians to their own oaks as the material of oars. Balm came from Gilhead (Gen. xxxvii., 28), but balm of a better quality seems to have been imported from the lower Jordan valley (Strabo xvi., 2, par. 41). From the Damascene Syrians they imported "wine of Helbon (Strabo xvi., 3, par. 22) and white wool; from this Syrian wool, mixed perhaps with some coarser sort, seems to have been woven "damask," mentioned in Amos (iii., 12).

Their commerce with Egypt was both ancient and very extensive. They had settled at Memphis (perhaps about 4000 B. C.), and Phœnician trade soon took firm root there. From Egypt they imported "fine linen," natron for glass, papyrus, earthenware, scarabs, statuettes and in later times sarcophagi. They exported thither wine on a large scale, tin and purple garment (Pliny, N. H. xii., 39, 40).

"With Arabia," says Rawlinson, "Phœnician trade was of special importance, since not only did the great peninsula itself produce many of the most valuable articles of commerce, but it was also mainly, if not solely, through Arabia that the Indian market was thrown open to Phœnician trades."²⁷

The Sabæans brought the wares and spices of India and East Africa by sea to Yemen, whence they were taken by caravans to Haran, and there delivered to Phœnician merchants or exchanged for the costly fabrics of Chaldæa and Babylon (Pliny, N. H. xii., 39, 40). Thus Haran was a sort of exchange, or mart, for the merchants of Phœnicia, Arabia and Babylonia. The medium of exchange was originally in kind—corn and oxen being bartered for provisions, liquids, etc., and later the precious metals. Their money was in the shape of a metallic currency by weight. In ancient Babylonia, as in Egypt, the precious metals, especially silver, circulated as uncoined ingots.²⁸ The Phœnician unit of value, the shekel, weighed nearly half an ounce (230 grains). The first mention of a business contract in Scripture occurs in Genesis xxiii., 16, when Abraham bought the field from Ephron the Hittite, and "weighed to him the silver which he had named in the audience of the sons of Heth, four hundred shekels of silver, current money with the merchant."

Both Assyria and Babylonia supplied the Phœnicians with fabrics

²⁷ Cf. Hd. iii., 107. Sheba in Yemen was the emporium of Arabian trade, consisting chiefly of gold, gems, ivory, ebony and wrought iron.

²⁸ The Assyrians had both ring and ingot money, silver forming the standard value of all purchaseable objects. The Egyptians used ingots for convenience, threaded on wire; also twists of copper wire, called S. Tabnu, and rings of gold. The Lydians were probably the first nation that used gold and silver coins, which were of an ovoid, slightly flattened shape, about 700 B. C. (Hd. i., 94).

of extraordinary value, rich in a peculiar embroidery and deemed so precious that they were packed in cedar chests, which the Phœnicians must have brought with them from Lebanon (Ezek. xxvii., 23, 24). The wares of Assyria were sometimes exported to Greece (Hdt. i., 1). From this country came the cylinders in rock crystal, jasper, hematite and steatite, chiefly for Phœnician colorists in Cyprus and Crete. "Babylonia," says Sayce,²⁹ "was preëminently an industrial and commercial state, carrying on commerce with all parts of the known world, and there was therefore a highly elaborate commercial code of law. As might have been expected in a commercial community, no stigma attached to trade. All members of the state took part in it, and we find even the crown prince Belshazzar acting through his agent as a wool merchant."

In the time of Solomon (1000 B. C.) Hiram, King of Tyre, sent cedar wood and precious metals, together with Tyrian workmen, for the Temple at Jerusalem. Among the various works in bronze executed by them were palm trees, lilies, lions, oxen and cherubim, the favorite subjects of such Phœnician works of art as have come down to us (III. Kings vii., 13). Doors of cedar overlaid with gold afforded entrance, and before these hung veils of blue, purple and scarlet of the brightest and softest linen, wrought with curious flowers.

When the foundation stones were dug up in recent years they bore the marks of the Phœnician masons painted in red.

After the fall of Tyre the Jews, kinsmen of the Phœnicians, were greatly favored both by Alexander and his successors, especially at Antioch and Alexandria, which now became the chief emporia of the East. At Alexandria they were placed on a level with the Greeks, above the native Egyptians. But it was not till they were scattered by foreign invasions and by the destruction of Jerusalem (70 A. D.) that they began to develop those commercial qualities for which they have since been so famous.

VI.

It only remains to sketch briefly to their close the fortunes of Carthage. After her restoration in 814 B. C. she had rapidly increased in wealth and power, and gradually acquired the Phœnician trade in the western Mediterranean. Like all Phœnician colonies, Carthage had an admirable situation; there were two good natural harbors, and the town was strongly fortified, while the fertile plain

²⁹ Encycl. Brit. (art. "Babylonia"). The "code of Hammurabi" (2285 B. C.) formed the basis of Assyrian and Babylonian law for nearly two thousand years.

³⁰ *Harper's Magazine*, 1904.

in which she stood was well suited for tillage, and she could export large quantities of corn to neighboring cities.

Carthage was the one Phœnician colony which seems to have cherished political ambitions. She commenced a career of conquest in Africa and obtained tribute and levies in war from the Libyans and other tribes. Vergil (*Aen. I.*) speaks of her as—"Carthago, . . . dives opum, studiisque asperrima belli." She carefully restrained the other Punic cities on the African coast, such as Utica, from ever becoming her rivals. Like the Phœnicians, the Carthaginians endeavored to keep a monopoly of commerce and drive all rivals out of the field. Thus, according to one of their treaties, the Romans were excluded from trading with Sardinia and Libya, and when the Greeks colonized Marseilles and islands off the north of Spain they were prevented from trading with the Spanish mainland. The feud between Greek and Phœnician began when the latter were ousted from the *Ægean Sea*, 1327 B. C.

In the fifth century B. C. the Semitic portion of the East twice assailed Greece in Sicily under the leadership of Carthage. The Greek colonies there held their own, but did not drive out the invaders. It was reserved for another power to do this and drive the Semite out of Europe.

The Greek antagonism to the Phœnicians was continued by the Romans towards the Carthaginians, and a collision between these two great and growing powers was inevitable. The character and aims of Aryan and Semite were as mutually incompatible as light and darkness. In the course of time one or other must perish.

The first Punic war in which Rome engaged was for Sicily, and Rome won it, expelling the Syrian colonists from the island. In revenge Hannibal conquered Spain in 218 B. C. and crossed the Alps into Italy. But by 205 B. C. the Romans had reconquered Spain, crossed over to Africa and made that a Roman province. The value of the trade of Carthage and the natural advantages of her position are most easily seen in the interval between the second and third Punic war. Even when her political power was broken, she advanced so rapidly in wealth that the Romans feared she would rally her forces, and therefore wisely acted on Cato's repeated warning: "*Delenda est Carthago.*" She was taken at length and destroyed in 146 B. C. How desperate was the struggle, how firmly the Phœnician colonists had planted themselves in the west may be seen from the fact that seven hundred years after the fall of Carthage men still talked Punic, or Phœnician, in North Africa. The Bible itself (St. Augustine tells us) was translated into that language, and this only died out before its kindred dialect of Arabic in the eighth century of our era.

So Tyre and Sidon had their day and became at length "a naked rock, a drying place for nets," but the memory of what they achieved will live forever. Were it only for the invention of the alphabet they claim a place among the greatest benefactors of mankind. While unable altogether to agree with the statement of a recent writer that the alphabet "is perhaps, without exception, the most stupendous achievement of the human intellect within historical times. . . . It made possible for the first time that education of the masses upon which all later progress of civilization was so largely to depend,"⁸⁰ we may perhaps accept Professor McCurdy's more sober estimate that "it has become the main working instrument of the world's civilization." Newman has said that "Attica has formed the human intellect," yet this she could never have done if the means had not been afforded her by the practical Phœnician trader, whose alphabet superseded the complicated writing systems of Egypt and Babylon and the "Mycenæan" syllabaries. Both the hieroglyphic writings and the cuneiform consisted of several hundred symbols and combinations, whereas the Phœnician alphabet contained but twenty-two.

Moreover, they carried civilization round the Mediterranean shores. The first seats of commerce were also the first seats of civilization. Exchange of merchandise led to an exchange of ideas, and the peoples of the "Great Sea," as the Hebrews called it, first became acquainted with Egyptian and Babylonian science and art through the Phœnicians. In a later age Greek art and letters, which they had done so much to form, spread down the old Phœnician lines of communication and became the great civilizing influence in the Roman Empire, till in the first century of the Christian era Greek (the "common dialect") was the chief language spoken round the Mediterranean, being also the language used by the writers of the New Testament. Thus, though the Phœnicians were engaged in seeking wealth for its own sake, and had no worthy notion of using it, they were unconsciously preparing the minds of the Mediterranean peoples for that higher civilization, Christianity, and paving the way for the spread of the Gospel. They were thus most wonderfully raised up, as for other reasons, so especially to be ministers to a Divine Revelation, of which personally they knew nothing.

"Civilization," as Newman⁸¹ says, "is the systematic use, improvement and combination of those faculties which are man's characteristic; and, viewed in its idea, it is the perfection, the happiness of our mortal state. It is the development of art out of nature and of self-government out of passion, and of certainty out of

⁸¹ *Historical Sketches* (The Turks, lect. 4).

opinion, and of faith out of reason. Supernatural truth is its sovereign law. Such is it in its true idea, synonymous with Christianity; and, not only in idea, but in matter of fact also, *is* Christianity ever civilization, as far as its influence prevails; but, unhappily, in matter of fact, civilization is not necessarily Christianity."

Still the civilization which the Phoenicians spread around the shores of the "Great Sea" did not begin and end with itself; it heralded and prepared the way for Christianity, just as the dim light of the dawn foretells the brightness of the perfect day. Perhaps Isaias (xxiii., 18) had in mind this, their civilizing mission, when he prophesied of Tyre: "Her merchandise and her hire shall be sanctified to the Lord; her merchandise shall be for them that shall dwell before the Lord." At all events, this work of preparation, fraught with such far-reaching issues, forms not the least of their claims to the lasting and grateful remembrance of mankind.

J. D. MURPHY, S. J.

St. Beuno's College, North Wales.

THE EDUCATIONAL FACT.

LAST April I proposed to the readers of this QUARTERLY a scholastic question and outlined the principles on which the question should, in my judgment, be answered. I asked: In what has our school system profited by the superabundant literature published during the last century on the subject of education? What impress has the pedagogical activity which inspired that literature, or has been inspired by it, left upon our school laws? Our national interest in so important a subject, if intelligently directed, ought surely to have borne some fruit worthy of us and profitable to the common weal. We ought by 'his time to have a clearer, more comprehensive and widespread appreciation of what we are aiming at and of the methods to be used for the realization of our purpose. Our patriotic zeal in the cause of education ought above all to have resulted in the establishment of a school system growing from year to year more efficient in its application of suitable means to a well-defined end. Has it borne this fruit?

We have undoubtedly multiplied schools so as to put the acquisition of an elementary education within the reach of practically every child in the land, and to make the attainment of secondary, and even higher education, a matter of comparatively little difficulty. Estimated in money, the value we attach to our school

policy may be inferred from the fact that our annual expenditure for elementary education alone is over two hundred and fifty million dollars; that within a period of ten years it has increased fifty per cent., although within the same period the pupils of our common schools have increased only about twenty-three per cent.¹ Add to this the sums of money that are annually expended in the conduct and management of high and normal schools, of manual and industrial schools, of State colleges and universities, and we shall have a total yearly outlay for education that indicates no niggardly spirit in the use of public revenues. Schools we have, and we are paying liberally for them; nor need this disturb us, if they serve efficiently a civic purpose.

But how are we to measure their efficiency? Is it merely by the fact that the percentage of those who cannot read or write is progressively vanishing, or that the per capita wealth of the nation is steadily increasing? It may be conceded that it is one of the functions of government to promote national prosperity, and that in the economic conditions of our modern life an elementary education is necessary for every citizen, if he is to get his share of the general affluence. Nor will it be denied that under our form of government an elementary education is a desirable qualification for all citizens who are to exercise the right of suffrage. But desirable as it may be that every voter should be able to read his ballot and the campaign literature with which his party supplies him prior to his casting it, this of itself is no indication that he will not sell his vote to the highest bidder or be guided in his use of it by principles neither of patriotism nor of morality. And necessary as are the intelligence and industry that produce wealth, it is of more importance that no citizen use his intelligence and industry to become actual possessor of that portion of the general wealth which in justice or equity belongs to another. That only six per cent. of our white population of ten years and over is illiterate, and that

¹ In 1890 the number of pupils enrolled in the common schools of the country was 12,722,581; in 1900, 15,503,110. In 1890 the annual expenditure for school purposes was \$140,506,715, and in 1900, \$214,964,618. It is noticeable that only a very small part of this increase in expenses is due to an increase in salaries of teachers. In 1893—the earliest date of which I could find a record—the average yearly salary of male teachers was \$447.80, and of female teachers \$374.80. These increased respectively in 1903 to \$499.80 and \$405.10; that is to say, the increase in ten years was about eleven per cent. for men and less than nine per cent. for women. Yet during the same period the increase in the expenditure for combined salaries of superintendents and teachers has increased nearly fifty per cent. In this connection an observation of the United States Commissioner of Education is significant. "Twenty-two years ago," he says, "the percentage of male teachers was nearly forty-three, while the last year (1901-1902) it had fallen below twenty-eight."

everybody in the country is in the eyes of the statistician of averages worth nearly twice as much as he was thirty or forty years ago is comforting; but not so comforting as it would be if we were sure that a very large majority of the other ninety-four per cent., in whom education has awakened the impulse and developed the faculty of acquiring material prosperity, were not governed by a mad desire to possess riches without serious thought of the morality of their methods, except in so far as they impinge on legality or business conventions. One need not be a reactionary, obscurantist or other disreputable thing in order to doubt the value of education if the masses on whom it is conferred have been rendered capable merely of enjoying by personal perusal the daily anthology of wars and crimes, of sports and gambling, of fashion and finance, of industrial and political rivalries which their newspapers purvey; or if their highest intellectual activity consists in hastily imbibing once a day the editorial wisdom of some midnight scribe, or in following the plot of the latest popular novel, especially of such as bring the violation of God's commandments, the craft of successful commercial, financial or political knavery and the odor of the divorce courts under the roof of every home.

Mental education and material progress that may result therefrom do not constitute the adequate goal of attainment which we have set for our educational policy. It does not fully realize its aim merely by fitting the young to be expert agents in the promotion of prosperity. Our loyalty and resources were put into requisition for the establishment and support of our public schools, our interest and patriotism enlisted in their preservation and defense, on the distinct ground that they were to be seminaries of citizenship; that their foremost purpose was, and their crowning effect would be the formation of the youth of this nation to a manhood that would safeguard, elevate and enlarge American civilization. In the Constitution of nearly all our States it is expressly ordained that it shall be the duty of the Legislature to establish an efficient system of public schools, because through their instrumentality good government and the stability of our republican institutions will be secured. Many declare that a general diffusion of education is "essential to the preservation of the rights and liberties of the people." There is no State that does not by its fundamental laws make education a function of government and instruct its Legislature to provide for its universal communication. One of them goes so far as to declare that the establishment of schools is a function of government superior to and supremely controlling all others. The jurists who drafted the Constitution which the people of Florida ratified in 1868 put the following section into the article on educa-

tion: "It is the *paramount duty*² of the State to make ample provision for the education of all children residing within its borders." This unanimity regarding the necessity of education, and the constitutional duty imposed by the people of every State on their Legislatures respecting it, can have only one rational explanation. They were profoundly convinced of its importance for the essential well-being of the State and of its value as an agency in the formation of good citizens. It was to prepare heirs of their political fortune who should be worthy of it and capable of transmitting it unimpaired to future generations that in the fundamental compact, defining the form and structure of the State, they bound their Legislatures to provide schools and the means of education.

Citizenship, I showed in my last article, calls for a group of virtues that are not acquired by a merely intellectual or scientific education. A good citizen is more than a man of knowledge and developed mind; he is a man of character—a man of personal integrity, of social worth and responsibility, and of civic honor unselfishness and zeal. In his private life purity and tenderness, love of his own hearth and devotion to its interests make his daily homecoming a joy and a grace to his family. His relations with his fellow-men are characterized by an habitual sense of justice and sincerity and of toleration and kindliness. His patriotism is a synthesis of chivalrous ardor and business-like prudence. He practises those principles of social righteousness which the Constitution of Massachusetts declares it shall be the duty of legislatures and magistrates in all future periods of that Commonwealth to countenance and inculcate—"the principles of humanity and general benevolence, public and private charity, industry and frugality, honesty and punctuality in their dealings, sincerity and good humor and all social affections and generous sentiments among the people." This ideal of citizenship may be unattainable; an ideal generally is in this world. Like Kantian holiness, though the bourn of our efforts and pursuit, it can be realized only in an indefinite series of continual approximations to an end that can never be reached. Or perhaps better, it is, like a mathematical limit, a term of perfection to which we should ever tend, which we may never reach, but to which we can approach nearer than any assignable imperfection. It is the asymptote of life's path, always beyond contact, but ever determining the line along which we must move until union is effected in infinity. That an ideal is unattainable, however, is no reason why we should not pursue it, if the pursuit itself is necessary to keep us in the course of our destiny. Without an ideal to lure us

² The italicization in this citation and in others throughout this article are, unless otherwise noted, the present writer's.

upward we sink by degrees into a world where all knowledge comes from sense, and reason measures reality; where materialism is science and rationalism is philosophy; where thought and aspiration range within the confines of experience, and virtue, refinement, and nobility are translated into terms of utilitarianism. An ideal, because it is an ideal, may after our efforts to attain it be a source of discontent and pain to us, demonstrating as it does that there is something always unattained; yet its attestation to us is that which the young Seraph gave to him who stood upon the mountain, musing on the dreams of old and looking for "a mystic city, goal of high emprise:"

There is no mightier spirit than I to sway
The heart of man, and teach him to attain
By shadowing forth the unattainable.

That the best education which we can give will fall short of its purpose and fail to produce at once and in every case the highest and most perfect type of citizenship, is no motive for lowering our standards to a level at which we fancy we may obtain the gratification of successful attainment. Success in such a case would be failure. Nor are the practical difficulties, of whatever kind they may be, arguments for abandoning a principle and holding as a doctrine of perfection, that studies and disciplines, the peculiar and specific character of which consists in their formative effect on character, should be eliminated from our educational system.

I furthermore showed that the qualities which go to make good citizens are not normally and in their germane forms possessed, unless conscience be trained in childhood and youth by the inculcation of morality; and that a vital morality, one namely which is not merely influential enough to appeal to the emotions of childhood or the undeveloped reason of youth, but powerful enough to restrain the ambition, the strength of passion, and the vigor of personality in manhood can be inculcated by the presentation of ideals of conduct and life which religion alone supplies. The only question to answer then is whether the moral and religious training that preserve and invigorate citizenship and civilization are to-day, because of the educational principles which during the last three-quarters of a century we as a people have been reducing to practice, developed wisely and effectively by our system of public schools.

I.

In the first place, then, has the profession and practice of religion grown with the growth of our public schools? Have we become more profoundly convinced of the truths of Christianity and more devout in our allegiance to it? The question so limited may or

may not be fully answered by two contrasted facts, yet they should be kept in mind by those who undertake to give an answer. When the movement to which our present school system is due was started, in 1837, Horace Mann was chosen to direct it. In an educational document which he issued shortly after his appointment to the secretaryship of the Massachusetts State Board of Education he tells us that not one-third of the children of the Commonwealth between the ages of five and fifteen attended school, and of those who did show some appreciation of the value of an elementary education many were satisfied with three or four years of irregular attendance during the year. Over two-thirds of the children, therefore, were growing up illiterates. To-day, less than seventy years after he planted the seed that has since sprung up and ripened to maturity, not one-third of the people of this country profess any religion, and of those who do many attend divine worship as irregularly as the children of Massachusetts in 1840 attended school. More than two-thirds of the American people, therefore, are to-day what may be called religious illiterates. Making due allowance for the errors and defects that exist in census returns or computations, conceding even that many who profess no definite form of belief acknowledge vaguely the existence of a Supreme Being and a future state of rewards and punishments, and entertain in their hearts some undefined Christian religiosity, the fact remains that illiteracy has uniformly decreased with the extension of the public school system, and that the profession and practice of religion has diminished with an increase of literacy. A curious aftermath this, or at least coincidence of popular education. Its significance lies precisely in this, that our public school system has not fostered religion. Whether they have exerted a positive influence in the disintegration of religious belief is a question I am not now considering. My inquiry regards their failure to promote either directly or indirectly an elevating force that is the leaven of civilization and the marrow of good citizenship. And the fact is that whatever other beneficent results they have produced, they have failed in what is fundamental.

This outgrowth of popular education was not aimed at by Horace Mann and his colleagues. They professed to believe that a purely secular education, one namely from which religion was excluded, would be calamitous for the country. The founder of our public school system is declared by one of his panegyrists to have had "strong convictions on the importance of moral and practical religious instruction and training in the schools," and "a genius for morality and practical religion in their application to common affairs." "No idea was more abhorrent to Horace Mann," he

furthermore says, "than the extreme secular theory of the common schools advocated by an influential body of educators, and to some extent actually enforced during the past thirty years." That the culmination of his labors should be schools from which religion, the basis of morality, is dislodged, and that the people among whom these schools have prospered should have so widely abandoned religion in practice, must cause his disembodied spirit some twinges of distrust as to the wisdom with which he employed his genius while sojourning in Massachusetts.

Nor did they anticipate such a result. On the contrary, they scented from afar a glorious harvest of goodness and religious virtue from the establishment and expansion of the public school system. They saw in their mind's eye a blessed age, when all the people would say: "Come, let us go up to the mountain of the Lord and to the house of the God of Jacob, and he will teach us his ways, and we will walk in his paths." How profoundly convinced Horace Mann was of the stupendous greatness of his work as an agent of spiritual regeneration is shown by an address which he delivered in 1840, in which he indirectly pays himself the compliment of being the author of the greatest social boon in human history, and rising on the wings of prophecy foretells for posterity the coming of Saturnian days. "The common school," he says, "is the institution which can receive and train up children in the elements of all good knowledge and virtue before they are subjected to the alienating competitions of life. This institution is the greatest discovery ever made by man; we repeat it, *the common school is the greatest discovery ever made by man.*³ . . . Other social organizations are curative and remedial; this is preventive and an antidote. They come to heal diseases and wounds; this is to make the physical and moral frame invulnerable to them. Let the common school be expanded to its capabilities, let it be worked with the efficiency of which it is susceptible, and nine-tenths of the crimes in the penal code would become obsolete; the long catalogue of human ills would be abridged; man would walk more safely by day; every pillow would be more inviolate by night; property, life and character held by a stronger tenure; all rational hopes regarding the future brightened." All this, of course, is the vaticination of a rhapsodist. On no experience of the past were these predictions and promises of Mann based, nor on any wide and thorough knowledge of human nature; nor on any intellectual grasp of the forces that he was dealing with. The grounds on which was supported this forecast of the future physical social and spiritual blessings that were to flow from his reconstruction of the public school

³ The italics are Mann's.

system were purely subjective, the dreams of an educational Alnascher, who without perceiving it kicked aside Christianity, the very element of education that might have helped to the verification of his prophecy. Nevertheless they seemed to him to have objective reality; his beliefs and anticipations were evidence beyond the shadow of even an imprudent doubt. Prophecy, it has been said, is a harmless business provided you do not invest in it. But we did invest in it. We took Horace Mann and his fellow-prophets at their own valuation. They made large promises, and we accepted him and his followers as inspired leaders.

The problem of teaching religion in the schools confronted Mann as it is confronting us to-day, though to-day it has grown more many-headed. At the time he was working out his plan of school reform a large number of influential persons in Massachusetts had revolted against New England Calvinism and become Unitarians. Among these was Mann himself, though his biographer tells us that he could have said of himself: "My heart is Unitarian, but my nerves are still Calvinistic." There were therefore practically but two religious denominations in the State, and the problem of so conducting the common schools that the children of both these denominations should be taught religion was practically in the hands of one whose ideals and sympathies were Unitarian, while his energy and intensity of purpose were Calvinistic. To the unsophisticated it looks as if there were only one solution then, as there is only one now, and that is to accommodate the school to the home. Any other solution would make the school, which should be an adjunct and extension of the home, an institution adverse or at least alien to it. But the reformer, "with the heart of a Unitarian and the nerves of a Calvinist," attempted another solution. He could not recognize the previous question: Is the school for the sake of the home or the home for the sake of the school? He cited the law providentially passed by the Legislature of Massachusetts on April 20, 1837, two years before he resigned his position as President of the Senate, in order to begin his career as an educational reformer. This law prohibited the teaching of any denominational religion in the State schools; and Mann himself had a prominent, if not the greatest part, in the drafting and enactment of it. Under conditions, therefore, which were of his own creation his problems became more complex. He was to devise a method by which religion should be taught in the schools without violating the majesty of his law. They were to teach no religion that might be called denominational, and at the same time teach a religion that would satisfy two antagonistic sects: those who professed a belief in supernatural revelation and those who rejected

it; those who held tenaciously to the creed of Calvin, and those who utterly repudiated it; those who, according to Mann's own profession of faith,⁴ believed that revealed religion would inevitably vanish before the superior claims of natural religion, as the day-star does before the light of the rising sun, and those who were convinced that such a belief was a reversal to deism and a step backwards towards atheism.

A man of more intellectual honesty would have shrunk from the task of finding a common term for such incommensurables. Not so Horace Mann. His purpose of dealing justly with the problem is indicated by his declaration that it was legal to have books treating of religious subjects in the schools, and that he "deplored the absence of moral and religious instruction in our schools;" but that "school committees had not found books expository of the doctrines of revealed religion, which were not also denominational." In other words, he was willing that religion should be taught provided it was not revealed religion, but his religion. Every exposition of the doctrines of revealed religion was definite, and therefore denominational. If those who professed a revealed religion could come to some agreement with those who hated all revealed religion, and could enunciate their agreement in a body of doctrines which would be vague enough to offend none and so definite as to please all, such an exposition would be recognized as not excluded by

⁴ "Natural religion stands as preëminent over revealed religion as the deepest experience over the lightest hearsay. The power of natural religion is scarcely begun to be understood or appreciated. The force and cogency of the evidence, the intensity and irresistibleness of its power are not known, because its elements are not developed and explained. It gives us more than an intellectual conviction—it gives a feeling of truth; and however much the light of revealed religion may have guided the generations of men amid this darkness of mortality, yet *I believe that the time is coming when the light of natural religion will be to that of revealed religion as the rising sun is to the day-star that precedes it.*"—*Mann's Journal*, May 8, 1837. Horace Mann had only one concept of supernatural religion, namely, that imbibed by him in early life, and expressing the malignity of the reformer of Savoy. Calvinism was the only form of Christianity that he really knew. This hideous caricature of the religion of Christ rose up before him whenever he came in presence of the real religion and distorted his vision. Nor was he exceptional in this. Many of the early Unitarians, and many since, have hated Christianity because they have thought of it in terms of Calvinism. The dismal doctrines of Calvin faced them at their birth, hovered over their cradles in infancy, tainted the cheerfulness of their boyhood and youth, soured and misdirected the energies of their manhood, took the sunshine out of their old age and cast its baleful shadows back over their lives and forward into eternity, as on their dying beds they awaited the presence of their maker. The revolt against it took on the form of a revolt against the essential doctrines of Christianity. In rejecting Calvin's horrible distortion of the religion in which mercy and truth have met, and justice and peace have kissed, they swung to the opposite extreme of rejecting also supernatural religion and the Godhead of Christ.

law. It was a clever ruse; first get a law passed implicitly disqualifying your adversary from using the public resources, and then generously offer him his share so far as the law permits. That accepted model of a trickster, a political boss, could not more deftly have led his opponent up into a blind alley and there offered him the right of way. In substance and principle it does not differ from the device said to be adopted sometimes by wicked aldermen when they are about to offer a municipal contract to the lowest bidder, yet wish it to fall to the lot of some loyal and deserving politician. It is said that this is effected by fixing the specifications in such a manner that only he can bid within the requirements of the law, for whose benefit the contract was predestined. In the language of the profession to which aldermen of this variety belong, "it was up to" the Evangelical Congregationalists to find a solution, and only one solution was possible—to acknowledge themselves beaten and to permit their lambs, if they were to make use of the educational pastures which their taxes helped to support, to be fed in the parched meadows of Unitarianism.

Accordingly Mann undertook to reduce the teaching of religion to such a minimum that its positive content could be refused by no denomination. The schools might teach "the principles of piety and morality common to all sects of Christians." In a letter to Mr. Combe—a name of ominous import—he conceded that the Bible might be read in the schools, because without interpretation it would be harmless. The exigencies of his law were respected by inventing a new sect, which may be called the Least Common Denomination. Religion in the schools was saved by banishing every belief that acknowledge the Godhead of Christ and the supernatural character of His message and mission. Thenceforth, until the principle invoked by Mann worked itself out to its logical issue, the public schools were in effect parochial schools of Unitarianism, although they were pharisaically dubbed non-sectarian. The whole procedure was a rather obvious attempt to use the public schools for the purpose of creating a State religion to take the place of the one which Massachusetts by the amendment to its Constitution of 1833 had abolished. There can be little doubt, therefore, that Horace Mann was earnestly in favor of teaching religion in the public schools. Later educators, however, who did not possess the peculiar logical acumen that goes "with the heart of a Unitarian and the nerves of a Calvinist," found this solution of the religious problem unsatisfactory, and excluded from the public schools even the religion of the Least Common Denominator. So the common schools of the country from being frankly denominational became non-sectarian, and an attempt was made to teach a religion which,

because it was no one's religion, was supposed to be acceptable to everybody; and then by the logic of facts developed into our present agnostic schools. This last position is frankly proclaimed as the spirit and law of the American State by a representative Unitarian. "The secular school must be more than non-sectarian," he says; "it must be religiously neutral. Religious freedom means more than the absence of sectarian instruction; it means the absence of all religious exercises and theological teachings."⁵

II.

The trend of opinion by which these changes were brought is clearly recorded in our constitutional history. The Constitutions drafted and adopted by the States, the enactments of Legislatures and the decisions of courts show a gradual but steady tendency towards a concept of the State according to which it becomes the duty of government to ignore religion completely. That the State is not a religious institution, and that the teaching of morality and religion is not a governmental function are truths which no advocate of the teaching of morality and religion in our public schools would deny. The historical definition of the State's purpose as given by Cicero, as found in Roman jurisprudence and embodied in the teaching of the Scholastics, distinctly denies to the State any direct jurisdiction over the spiritual lives of its citizens. Every Catholic theologian and political writer of any standing will admit the secular character of the State in this sense, that its direct interest and immediate scope is purely temporal.⁶ But they would not

⁵ On the same principle, civil liberty would mean the absence of all instruction in civics, and political liberty would mean the expulsion of all teaching of American history from our schools.

⁶ Suarez will, I presume, be taken as a representative exponent of Catholic doctrine on the nature of the State. In his work, *De Legibus*, he lays down the following propositions:

"Dico ergo *primo*: potestas civilis et jus civile *per se* non respiciunt aeternam felicitatem supernaturalem vitae futurae, tanquam finem proprium, vel proximum vel ultimum. . . . Dico potestatem civilem *per relationem extrinsecam* . . . posse ordinari ad supernaturalem felicitatem, ut ad ultimum finem," lib 3, cap. 11, nn. 4 and 5.

"Dico *secundo*, potestatem civilem non solum non respicere felicitatem aeternam vitae futurae, ut finem ultimum proprium, verum etiam nec *per se* intendere propriam spirituales felicitatem hominum in hac vita, et consequenter nec *per se* posse in materia spiritali disponere, aut leges ferre." Ibid, n. 6.

"Addo *tertio* potestatem civilem legislativam, etiam in pura natura spectatam, non habere pro fine intrinseco, et *per se* intento, felicitatem naturalem vitae futurae . . . sed ejus finem esse felicitatem naturalem communitatis humanae perfectae, cujus curam gerit, et singulorum hominum, ut sunt membra talis communitatis; ut in ea scilicet, in pace et justitia vivant et cum sufficientia bonorum quae ad vitae corporalis conservationem et com-

admit that of its nature it is secular in the sense that it must be aggressively on its guard against doing anything which would even indirectly and mediately foster or promote religion. Nor does the spirit of our political institutions entail so drastic an attitude towards religion that every activity of government must be quarantined against it. The opinion of Justice Sheldon, of the Supreme Court of Illinois,⁷ has more than a territorial value. "Religion and morality," he says, "are not so placed under the ban of the Constitution that they may not be allowed to become the recipients of any incidental benefit whatsoever from public bodies or authorities of State." The rigid policy of absolute non-intercourse between the State and religion is a recent doctrine of the extreme secularists. The original idea of religious equality which prevailed at the founding of this government they have abandoned for the Masonic idea of religious alienation borrowed from European rationalism. The State must be conceived, they think, as some sublimated essence abstracted from the people, which has gradually become something in character which its citizens neither singly nor collectively are or should be—an irreligious Leviathan. The idea of religious freedom which the founders of this government aimed to secure is embodied in the Federal Constitution and the first amendment to it. It in no way implies the Hegelian State. The Constitution declares that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." By the amendment it was further provided that "Congress shall make no laws respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." By these provisions equal political rights are conceded to every citizen, independently of his religious views, and precaution is taken that no one religious denomination to the exclusion of others get control of the government; but there is no hint that the government should assume towards religion an attitude of negative hostility. Judge Cooley, whose authority in the matter will scarcely be denied, commenting on the amendment, says:⁸

"By the establishment of religion is meant the setting up or recognition of a State Church, or at least the conferring upon one church of special favors and advantages that are denied to others. *It was never intended* by the Constitution that the government

moditatem spectant, et cum ea probitate morum quae ad hanc externam pacem et felicitatem reipublicae et convenientem humanae naturae conservationem necessaria est." Ibid, n. 7.

"Potestas (civilis), ut nunc est in principibus Christianis, in se non est major nec alterius naturae quam fuerit in principibus ethnicis." Ibid, n. 9.

⁷ Nichols vs. School Directors, 93 Illinois.

⁸ Principles of Constitutional Law. Students' Series, Chap. XIII.

should be prohibited from recognizing religion, or that religious worship should never be provided for in cases where a proper recognition of Divine Providence in the working of government might seem to require it, and where it might be done without drawing invidious distinctions between different religious beliefs, organization or sects."

The Constitutions of the States adopted and ratified immediately after the Federal Government only gave more express form to this concept of religious freedom. Except in the case of Massachusetts and New Hampshire, which virtually established State churches, their purpose was to safeguard the equal religious rights of their citizens. As Judge Cooley says in the work just cited, "They established a system not of toleration merely, but of religious equality." Some, it is true, exact a belief in the fundamental principles of natural religion as a qualification for the exercise of political rights; but this only confirms what I have said, that the spirit of the times was not a spirit of alienation from religion, but of equal justice towards it. Nor has the general principle that the State cannot take cognizance of religion in those functions of government that touch on the inner lives of citizens ever been universal in its practical application.

Scruples regarding the employment of the public fund to pay salaries for religious services have been set aside, for instance, when there was question of legislators and criminals. These two classes of citizens have been provided with chaplains, whose duty it was either to invoke God's aid or to minister religious instruction and comfort. It is not easy to see on what principle those who occupy our State prisons or reformatories and sit in our halls of legislation are conceded rights that are denied our children. If it be maintained that our legislators need the divine aid to legislate aright, to illumine their minds, to purify their hearts and to strengthen their wills, it may easily be answered that the seeking of that aid may as reasonably be left to the individual consciences of our legislators as the religious instruction and training of children are left to the individual care of parents. If, however, it be urged that legislation, being a supreme act of political power far-reaching in its effects, needs the divine assistance in an especial manner, it will hardly be denied that the making of the future citizens, who are to observe the law enacted by the legislator, is of less importance; and it might even be contended that many of our present lawmakers would be less of a scandal to us, if the schoolhouse of a generation ago had been truly religious. And if religion is recognized as a necessary element in the reformation of our criminals, why may we not look upon it as a necessary element in the formation of our

citizens? Surely from every point of view—humanitarian, economic and social—early formation is better than belated reformation. It used to be thought that an ounce of prevention was better than a pound of cure. Moreover, the general principle, if fully enforced, would lead to a denial of religious liberty. To use for the common good public funds under such conditions as to prevent participation in the benefits accruing therefrom by those who profess a religion recognized in the Constitution of the State as entitled not merely to toleration, but to civil and political equality with others, is practically to put restraints on the freedom of conscience. The opinion of Justice Appleton, of the Supreme Court of Maine, that “a law is not unconstitutional because it may prohibit what a citizen may conscientiously think right, or *require what he may conscientiously think wrong*,”⁹ though it is a logical consequence of the political theory that the State may in the prosecution of its end entirely prescind from the religion of its citizens, and act practically and universally as though they had no religion, is nevertheless, in the clause which I have italicized, a clear refusal to acknowledge the citizen’s right to freedom of conscience. And the fact that the State does not exert physical force in compulsion does not lessen the tyranny. If the citizen is by law put in such a position that he must either forego the rights of conscience or the right to his share of the common good, he is as effectively deprived of religious equality as though he were imprisoned for his belief.

III.

The first national enactment on the relation of religion to education after the Declaration of Independence is found in the ordinance of 1787, passed by the Congress of the Confederation for the gov-

⁹ *Donahoe vs. Richards*, 38 Maine. The Constitution of Maine, of which Justice Appleton was the legal interpreter, supports only the first clause in his opinion. “All men have a natural and inalienable right,” it says in Article I, Section 3, “to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences, and no one shall be hurt, molested or restrained in his person, liberty or estate for worshipping God in the manner and season most agreeable to the dictates of his conscience, provided he does not disturb the public peace nor obstruct others in their religious worship.” Catholic moralists make a distinction between an affirmative precept of conscience, which they say “*obligat semper sed non pro semper*,” and a negative precept of conscience, which they say “*obligat semper et pro semper*.” That is to say, an affirmative precept, though its obligation is permanent, does not require that the action prescribed should be unceasingly put, and, moreover, for grave reasons permits its omission; but a negative precept does not, under any circumstance, permit the positing of the action prohibited. Circumstances might arise, for instance, in which the civil authorities could legitimately forbid Catholics for a time to observe the commandment of hearing Mass on Sunday, but under no circumstances could it command them to take part in a worship which their consciences tell them is false.

ernment of the territory lying northwest of the Ohio river and east of the Mississippi, and now comprising the States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin and the eastern part of Minnesota. This act ordains "that the following articles shall be considered as articles of compact between the original States and the people and States in said territory, and forever remain unalterable, unless by common consent, to wit: . . . Art. 3. *Religion, morality and knowledge* being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." Furthermore, in the territorial governments provided by Congress for Indiana in 1800, for Michigan in 1805 and for Illinois in 1809, it is in each case enacted: "That there shall be established within said territory a government in all respects similar to that provided by the ordinance of Congress passed on the 13th of July, one thousand seven hundred and eighty-seven." The question whether the provision of the ordinance contained in article 3 laid a permanent obligation on the States organized out of the Northwest Territory to use their schools for the promotion of religion, morality and knowledge may be open to discussion, but there can be no doubt that it is an indication of the public opinion of the time when it was enacted.¹⁰ Of the States formed out of the Northwest Territory Ohio alone on becoming a member of the Union inserted the formula of the Continental Ordinance into its Constitution. In article 8, section 3 of the Constitution of 1802 it declares that, "*Religion, morality and knowledge* being *essentially* necessary to the good government and happiness of mankind, schools and means of instruction shall forever be encouraged by legislative provision not inconsistent with the rights of conscience." Again, in the Constitution of 1851, though the wording of the section is varied, the same motive is assigned for the State's concern with education. Indiana in its two Constitutions, one ratified in 1816 and the other in 1851, declares that "*Knowledge and learning* being *essential* to the preservation of good government," it shall be the duty of the General Assembly to encourage by all suitable

¹⁰ The decisions of the courts regarding the obligatory character of the ordinance are not uniform. Some held that it was a compact which could not be altered without the consent both of the people of the State and of the United States, given through their representatives, "unless we assume the principle that the sovereign power of a State is not bound by compact." Others held that upon the adoption of a Constitution by one of these States, and its admission into the Union, the ordinance ceased to have effect. This latter opinion is supported by the authority of the Federal Supreme Court. Specifically, Justice Cassoday in 1899 held, in the case known as *State vs. District Board*, that the third article of the ordinance "became superceded and ceased to be longer in force in Wisconsin by that State's admission into the Union." See Cooley's Constitutional Limitations, Seventh Edition, p. 54, n. 1.

means *moral*, intellectual, scientific and agricultural improvement. The educational clause of Minnesota's Constitution, ratified in 1857, is more cautious. "The stability of a republican form of government," it says, "depending mainly upon the intelligence of the people, it shall be the duty of the Legislature to establish a general and uniform system of public schools." The other three States—Illinois, Michigan and Wisconsin—simply instruct their respective Legislatures to provide educational facilities without assigning any reason why education should be considered a function of government. We have, therefore, four types: States which base the Legislature's duty of promoting education on the principle that religion, morality and knowledge is necessary for good citizenship, or on the necessity of morality and knowledge for that purpose, or simply on the necessity of intelligence, and States that assign no principle for the civil authorities assuming the duty of education.

The other States admitted as members of the Union after Ohio put themselves by their first Constitutions into one or other of these classes, though many of them changed their views in subsequent Constitutions. Mississippi in 1817 adopted the formula of the Continental Ordinance, which it reiterated in 1832. But in 1868 it omits all reference to religion, being satisfied that "the stability of a republican form of government depends mainly upon the intelligence and virtue of the people." Arkansas, following the lead of Indiana, declares in 1836 that "knowledge and learning, generally diffused through a community," are "essential to the preservation of a free government." Having thought better of it in 1868, it ordains in the Bill of Rights that "Religion, morality and knowledge being essential to good government, the General Assembly shall pass suitable laws to protect every religious denomination in the peaceable enjoyment of its own mode of public worship; and to encourage schools and the means of instruction." However, it experienced another change of mind in 1874. The section of the Bill of Rights is retained so far as it relates to the protection of every religious denomination in the peaceful enjoyment of its own mode of public worship. But the clause making the necessity of religion, morality and knowledge the reason for encouraging schools is suppressed, and in place of it is substituted section 7 of the article on education, which says that "*intelligence and virtue*, being the safeguards of liberty and the bulwark of a free and good government, the State shall ever maintain a general, suitable and efficient system of free schools." The experience of Kansas in making Constitutions is unique. Four are said to have been ratified within five years. In the Topeka Constitution of 1855 the necessity of religion, morality and knowledge for good government is given as a reason

for encouraging education. In the Constitution adopted at a convention which met at Lecompton in 1857 the reason becomes the essential need of a general diffusion of knowledge for the same purpose. In the Mineola Constitution of 1858, the declaration of the Topeka Constitution is reasserted in the Bill of Rights, while at the same time in article 8 "the stability and perpetuity of free republican institutions" is said to "depend upon the intelligence and virtue of the people, and for this reason "every child in the State shall be entitled to receive a good common school education at the public expense." Finally, in the Constitution of 1859, under which Kansas was admitted into the Union, all attempt to assign any principle on which the State should take care of education is abandoned. Missouri, in 1820, merely ordains that education is to be encouraged and enjoins upon its General Assembly the duty of guarding educational funds and of providing schools "where the poor shall be taught gratis." But in 1865 it borrows seemingly from the Texas Constitution of 1845 the phrasing of its educational enactment. This in its turn had been copied apparently, though more concisely worded, from the Maine Constitution of 1820. Missouri, however, attempts to improve it. The first section of its article on education reads: "A general diffusion of knowledge and intelligence being essential to the preservation of the rights and liberties of the people, the General Assembly shall establish and maintain free schools for the gratuitous instructions of all persons in this State between the ages of five and twenty-one." Again, in 1875, it asserts the same close connection between "free schools for the gratuitous instruction" of its future citizens, a general diffusion of "knowledge and intelligence" and the preservation of the rights and liberties of the people.¹¹ A great number of the States

¹¹ A comparison of the educational provisions of these Constitutions and those of Massachusetts and Rhode Island may be a matter of curiosity, if not of amusement. Massachusetts in 1780 declared that "*wisdom and knowledge, as well as virtue*, diffused generally among the body of the people" are "necessary for the preservation of their rights and liberties," and in a prolix sentence of one hundred and sixty words imposes on its legislature and magistrates the duty of cherishing educational interests, of encouraging institutions of education, and of countenancing and inculcating numerous virtues, among which it does not neglect to include "good humor." Maine, displeased perhaps with the verbosity of its mother State, drops "wisdom" and "virtue," and declares in one short, clear sentence that "a general diffusion of education" is essential to the preservation of the people's rights and liberties, without defining, as so many of the other States endeavor to do, what are the elements of education. Rhode Island, which until 1842 had managed without other Constitution than its colonial charter from Charles II., in that year drafted and ratified a Constitution, by the educational provision of which it rejected "wisdom" with Maine, but retained "virtue" with Massachusetts. "A diffusion of knowledge, as well as of virtue," it thought, was needed for the preservation of popular rights and liberties. Texas in

assume that education is a function of government without appealing to any theoretical principle. So far as I know—I have not been able to consult the latest Constitutions of some of the States—the only States at the present time that give a constitutional standing to religion in its relation to education are Ohio, North Carolina and Nebraska.

Besides this omission, which has gradually become established, there is another phase in the growth and development of our constitutional provisions regarding religion which is worth noticing. The early Constitutions, after declaring liberty of conscience and liberty of worship natural and inalienable rights, generally make compulsory support of any religious ministry or place of worship, or any preference by government of one religious denomination over another unlawful. The Constitution of Maryland of 1776, which remained unchanged until 1851, except for some amendments not substantially affecting the provision which I am going to cite, in the Bill of Rights ordains that "all persons professing the *Christian* religion are equally entitled to protection in their religious liberty . . . nor ought any person to be compelled to frequent, maintain or contribute to maintain, unless on contract, any particular place of worship or any particular ministry; yet the Legislature may, in their discretion, lay a general and equal tax for the support of the Christian religion, leaving to each individual the power of appointing the payment over of the money collected from him to the support of any particular place of worship or ministry. . . ." Pennsylvania and Tennessee, though guaranteeing by their Constitutions religious equality, deny political rights to one who does not believe in God and in a future state of rewards and punishments. Other States pronounce a man ineligible for public office who denies the existence of a Supreme Being. In general **the religious freedom** which was a fundamental principle of early Constitutions is far removed from the principle of extreme secularity advocated to-day.

Later these constitutional provisions for safeguarding religious equality were amplified. The rise and spread of the public school system necessitated a special application of general principles. Accordingly we find Maine in 1820 forbidding its Legislature to donate, grant or endow any literary institution "unless at the time of making such endowment the Legislature of the State shall have

1845 announced that "a general diffusion of knowledge" would serve the purpose. When Missouri, in 1865, tried to formulate its belief, it probably felt that a diffusion of knowledge was insufficient, and so added a diffusion of intelligence, both diffusions to be effected "by free schools for the gratuitous instruction of all persons in the State between the ages of five and twenty-one."

the right to grant any further powers, to alter, limit or restrain any of the powers vested in any such literary institution;" and Michigan in 1835 prohibiting the use of public money "for the benefit of religious societies or theological or religious seminaries. About 1850 this constitutional prohibition took another shape. Ohio in its Constitution of 1851 expresses it thus: "No religious or other sect or sects shall ever have any *exclusive rights to or control* of any part of the school funds of this State." This denial of exclusive rights to or control of the school fund by a religious sect is, about the same time and shortly afterwards, found in the Constitution of other States in practically the same form of words. None of these provisions, however, do more than forbid in the particular matter of schools the preference of one religious denomination to another, which is already generally prohibited in the Bills of Rights. They would not, for instance, if construed according to the sense of the words, render subventions to denominational schools for educational work done unconstitutional, provided these schools were subject to State supervision, and all were treated with equal fairness. But after the Civil War a marked spirit of opposition to the teaching of any religion in the public schools began to appear. Various forms of enactments, which more properly belong to the deliberative action of the legislature than to the organic law, were injected into the Constitutions for the purpose of making public education strictly non-sectarian. This non-sectarianism consisted at first in this, that religious instruction in the schools should be confined to the reading of King James' version of the Bible without note or comment; but has come in due course of time, as was to be expected, to signify the absolute exclusion of religious teaching from the public schools. Nevada in 1864 furnishes the earliest example, I believe, of the formula which is now adopted by many States. In the article of the Constitution on education it says: "No sectarian instruction shall be *imparted or tolerated* in any school or university that may be established under this Constitution." Nebraska in its Constitution of 1875, in spite of its inserting article 3 of the Ordinance of 1787 in its Bill of Rights, repeats the Nevada formula in the article on education. Colorado in 1876 and California in 1879 do the same. In the meantime Illinois in 1870 attempted so to word a prohibition against the payment of any money from the public treasury to a denominational school which should engage in providing what all the States concurred in holding essential to rights and liberties, that its evasion would become impracticable. This provision is interesting for the judicial opinions it gave rise to. The provision runs thus: "Neither the General Assembly, nor any county, city, town, township, school

district, or other public corporation shall ever make any appropriation or pay from any public fund whatever anything *in aid of* any church, or sectarian purpose, or *to help support or sustain* any school, academy, seminary, college, university or other literary or scientific institution controlled by any church or sectarian denomination whatever; nor shall any grant or donation of land, money or other personal property ever be made by the State or any such public corporation to any church or for any sectarian purpose."

Two actions at law which arose under this provision are noteworthy. The first occurred in 1887, and is known as the case of *Millard vs. Board of Education*. The facts of the case are briefly these: The district school board in St. Clair county, Illinois, being unable to provide otherwise, maintained one of the public schools in the basement of a Catholic church; the board appointed as teachers of this school only Catholics, and agreed to pay \$600 as rent for the use of the basement; Catholic children with their teachers were obliged by the pastor of the church to assemble at 8 A. M. to hear Mass, and after Mass to have instruction and recitations in catechism until 9 A. M.; the school exercises then commenced and continued until noon, when the Angelus was said by pupils and teachers. Objection was made to paying the rent agreed upon on **the ground that it was a violation of the provision of the Constitution which I have just cited.** The case came finally before the Supreme Court of the State and was decided in favor of the Board of Education, and consequently of the Catholic pastor who had rented the basement of his church. Justice Craig, who handed down the decision of the court, said:

a. "If the district where the school was maintained had no school house, and it became necessary for the Board of Education to procure a building to be used for school purposes, they had the right to rent of any person who had property suitable for school purposes; whether the owner was a Methodist, a Presbyterian, a Roman Catholic or any other denomination was a matter of no moment; nor was it material that the building selected had been used as a church."

b. "The school authorities may select a teacher that belongs to any church or no church, as they think fit."

c. "That children of Catholic parents and teachers are required to attend at the church at certain hours on school days, and hear Mass said by the priest . . . forms no ground of complaint;" since "there is no intimation that the Board of Education requires anything of this character. . . . Besides, attending Mass at the church has nothing to do with the school or its management," and on what ground "the complainant can complain because others, in

no way connected with him, may be required to attend Mass at the church we cannot comprehend."

d. The next allegation regarding instruction in catechism he disposes of the same way; because it is not claimed that such instruction is "directed, ordered or required by the Board of Education, or that they have anything to do with it;" nor "that the complainant's children are required against his will or desire to attend any religious or sectarian instruction in the school."

e. The allegation regarding the recital of the Angelus is disposed of on the ground that "it is nowhere claimed in the bill that this prayer is required by any regulation of the Board. . . . So far as it appears it is a merely voluntary matter among teachers and scholars which in no wise injures complainant."

In the following year, however, a more stringent interpretation was put upon the words "in aid of any church or sectarian purpose" by Justice Magruder, of the same court of Illinois, in the case of *County of Cook vs. Chicago Industrial School for Girls*. It should be remarked that in the decision of *Millard vs. Board of Education* Justice Magruder is on record as non-concurring. The Chicago Industrial School for Girls was a corporation which was entitled by law to take charge of girls committed to it by the courts. It had no buildings, but sent the girls either to St. Joseph's Orphan Asylum or the House of Good Shepherds, and to these institutions the incorporators of the Industrial School turned over the money paid by the County of Cook. This was the situation when officials of the County of Cook refused to pay the incorporators for the support and care of the girls committed to them, contending that such payment would be in aid of a settarian purpose, and therefore a violation of the Constitution. In pleading their case before the court the incorporators did not deny that the institutions to which they sent the girls were sectarian, but contended that only State appropriations to be used by managers of religious institutions without restraint or liability to account are referred to in the Constitution; that, provided there is a consideration for the money paid out, it cannot be said that these institutions are "aided." Justice Magruder rejected this interpretation of the Constitution for two reasons. The two clauses of the constitutional provision, he said, prohibit different things: the first clause prohibits appropriations and payments "in aid of" or "to help support or sustain" sectarian institutions; the second prohibits grants or donations to them. Unless there is a distinction between these two clauses, the second is surplusage. But surplusage in our Constitution is to the legal or judicial mind unthinkable. Again, it cannot be held, he said, that a contribution is no aid to an institution, because such

contribution is made in return for services rendered or work done. A school is aided by the tuition paid by its pupils, even though it gives an equivalent for money received. It is none the less true that a merchant is aided by his customers, though the relation between them is that of a buyer and seller. In this interpretation, therefore, of the phrases "in aid of," "to help support or sustain" there is only one way in which the State can observe the ordinations of its own Constitution, and that is by boycotting absolutely every religious institution. The idea of religious equality has been transformed into one of veiled hostility. The note of "religious" attached to an institution puts it under the ban of the Constitution as an alien thing with which the State can have no dealing. The law of Illinois as interpreted by Justice Magruder is undoubtedly the latest stage in the evolution of a movement to exclude religion from our national life, to put a wall of excommunication between it and that education which we so solemnly proclaim is "essential to the preservation of the rights and liberties of the people," "necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind" and "the stability of a republican form of government."

Nor is the reading of the Bible in the schools, to which so many sincere persons anchor their hope of yet retaining religion in the schools, any more secure than religion itself. It, too, is destined to go, and for the same reason that religion has gone; it is a sectarian book. There is a wide difference between the Supreme Court of Maine in 1854,¹² which decided that the Protestant version of the Bible was an unsectarian book, and that a Catholic child who refused to read it, even though she was willing to read the Douay version, might be dismissed from the school without violating her constitutional rights, and the Supreme Court of Wisconsin in 1899,¹³ which decided that the stated reading of any version of the Bible in the public schools, even when unaccompanied by any comment, was "sectarian instruction" within the meaning of the phrase as used in the Constitution. But I think it cannot be doubted, in view of the conglomerate religious character of the people who constitute our States, that the judgment of the Supreme Court of Wisconsin will prevail. It is true that there have been recent decisions in some States permitting the reading of the Bible in the class rooms of the public schools; but in some of them there was no constitutional provision forbidding religious instruction in the public schools, and in the one in which there was such a provision the legal character of the decision does not argue its own permanency. The decision of a court is not the law, but only *prima facie*

¹² *Donahoe vs. Richards*, 38 Maine.

¹³ *State vs. District Board*, 76 Wisconsin.

evidence, that is to say, not always conclusive evidence, of what the law is. If that decision is an evasion of an evident provision of a Constitution it will, unless the Constitution itself be amended, inevitably be reversed. If, therefore, the California, Colorado, Nevada and Nebraska type of Constitution be adopted universally, the Bible also must go out of the public schools. Its retention could only be justified by reducing it to the level of literature, as was advocated a few years since by the American Educational Association, or by putting it in the same category with the Iliad and the Koran, as the Supreme Court of Nebraska did.¹⁴

It is Gioberti, I think, who says that men fought almost wholly for power or gain before the incarnation of Christ; but that since the incarnation they fought largely for ideas, especially religious ideas. When the ideas, the creed and the dogma of the Bible become to us as unsubstantial and remote as the Olympic divinities and the Moslem faith, when its value shall have become merely literary, it will be a matter of no importance whether it is read in the public school or not. It will not be worth fighting for; we shall have returned to the condition of those who lived before the incarnation.

IV.

These, then, are the facts. Our public schools at the best are religious only in so far as the mere reading of the Bible is retained in them; and the tendency is to abolish this. The question of their relation to the morality of the country, space does not permit me to discuss; but the power that sustains morality is gone out of them. If we remember that the men and women of to-day were the school children of a generation since, and review the degrading, corrupt and lawless features of our national life which in recent years have become prominent, we may form our own judgment regarding the moral influence exerted by our public schools. What effect, therefore, has the educational literature of the last three-quarters of a century had on the moral and religious character of the training and instruction given under the ægis of the State? It would be a waste of time to show by citation that our organic and statute laws regarding education is a reflex of that literature. Occasionally a voice crying in the wilderness raised a protest against principles or practices that have led *recto tramite* to the present educational condition; but that voice was unheeded or drowned in the clamor of laudation and pseudo-patriotism that greets any criticism of defects in our public school system. To much of that laudation no one can reasonably demur; it would be easy to say with truth many

¹⁴ State vs. Scheve.

things in praise of our public schools. One fundamental defect, however, obscures their good qualities in the eyes of those who still hold the conviction that the parables of the two houses, one of which was built on a rock and the other on sand, conveys a lesson of prudence and wisdom. However imposing the public school system may be in appearance, it is thousands of years behind the age in the foundation it lays for the upbuilding of an efficient type of character.

In many respects the interests and outlook of the age of Plato differ widely from those of our own time; but in nothing, I think, is the contrast stronger than in the respective views of Plato and many modern educators regarding the fundamental principles of education; and the contrast is not to the discredit of the pagan. Plato insisted with all the powers of his transcendent intellect that the first care of the rulers of his ideal republic should be an education providing primarily for morality and religion. Our modern educators, after so many centuries, during which the sublime doctrines of Christianity have held sway, refashioning the judgments of men, reforming their convictions, elevating their aspirations, hopes and ideals, have succeeded in excluding the formal teaching of religion from the common schools of every State and Territory and in persuading a vast number of American citizens to accept, instead of the teaching of Christian morality, an umbral and emotional substitute based on no authority and secured by no adequate sanction. They have made the communication of religious instruction and the inculcation of Christian morality in those schools illegal. They have created a widespread conviction that this irreligious policy of education is the highest educational policy which the people of the United States are capable of attaining. It may seem strange, but it is an incontrovertible fact that so far as the fundamental aspects of education are concerned we have retrograded to principles that antedate Christianity and were disowned by pagan wisdom. This is a fact of curious significance—the most distinctive, notable and serious fact of our educational history.

To what causes are we to attribute it? Its origin, growth and lustihood are not to be explained by calling from the vasty deep such impalpable entities as the genius of our people, the spirit of our national life, the secular idea, an atheistic figment, or the *zeitgeist*, an abstraction made in Germany; because these words so far as they have any ideas behind them, signify the prevailing convictions of men at a given time. And the dominating prevalence of certain convictions is not explained by giving it another and a more vague name, even though that name be written in capital letters. Historical facts are, of course, effects of antecedent causes

acting as a rule steadily through a series of years, sometimes through secular periods. The progress of the movement by which they are produced may often be imperceptible to those who are carried onward by the current. It may be understood by those who take their bearings from subjective impressions to be an advance towards a goal, when it is in fact a recession from it or an ebbing tide when it may be flowing. The stream of an historical movement may seem retrograde, aberrant and lawless, or progressive, direct and uniform to him who fixes his eyes on small segments of its course, and never raises them to ascertain his direction by the light of a ruling luminary. But whatever the historical facts, they differ from other facts around us in that among their antecedent causes stand preëminently the coöperation of human activity and the directive power of human will. The primal impulses, intuitive wisdom and moral instincts of human nature may stay a social movement or deflect it from a course that leads to a haven of confusion; as, on the other hand, self-interest, estimated by the outlook of an economic day, the wisdom of unhumanizing philosophies or the dominance of great passions, may turn it into channels of degrading prosperity and demoralizing glory. The course of history may be changed, ennobled or depraved by the human agents that apparently drift along its surface, and its character at any given period is the resultant of the error or wisdom, the virtue or unrighteousness of preceding generations working through and with the present.

Furthermore, men do not act in unison unless under the influence of a common purpose and a common perception of the good to be obtained through the realization of that purpose; nor do they preserve over a long period of time continuously uniform action looking to the attainment of their purpose, unless under the guidance and government of a central directive power. The uninterrupted, methodical and progressive constancy with which the people of this vast nation have been working for nearly seventy-five years to get the least vestiges of religion out of their schools, would seem then to import the patient, tireless, determined and far-seeing efforts and direction of some hidden central power. The gradual but effective step by which this irreligious situation has been produced, **the continuity with which social forces have been directed to bring it about**, the steadiness and uniformity with which it has grown throughout every State of the Union, the fervor with which its apostles, however divergent and conflicting their views about details, have preached its fundamental principles, the subserviency with which it is accepted, even by those who loathe its tendency, the pæans of glorification of it that the slightest occasion will pro-

voke from men of the most different temperaments, politics and religions, the ostrich-like blindness of all parts of the community to its concededly ruinous effect on religious, moral and civic character—these aspects of this significant fact would seem to suggest the activity and rule of some such central power. The human mind naturally attributes a constant, uniform and universal effect to a commensurate cause.

The educational fact, therefore, consists in this, that virtually there is a national alliance to cut out of the curricula of our public schools those disciplines and studies that are essential to the formation of citizenship and the preservation of civilization, and that this alliance, so far as we can see, is directed slowly, cautiously and progressively towards the accomplishment of this purpose by some central agency unknown to us.

TIMOTHY BROSNAHAN, S. J.

Woodstock College, Md.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM IN RUSSIA (1796-1825).

I.

THE five years' reign of Paul I. (1796-1801) closed the eighteenth century in Russia in a sombre and inauspicious way, while his violent death opened the series of vindictive assassinations that disfigure the pages of modern Muscovite history, and recall the worst days of imperial Roman and Byzantine administration. He had good natural abilities and had received a suitable education. But the jealousy of Catharine kept him secluded; he was relieved of the education of his own children and forbidden to exhibit himself to the army. Her favorites, moreover, humiliated him.¹ At his accession he had reached the age of forty-two, was skilled in military affairs, but after the style of the Prussian army, and entertained no small degree of self-respect. He was a true autocrat, and said on one occasion: "There is no superior person in Russia except the one whom I address, and he is such only while I speak with him." During his long seclusion from public affairs he had surrounded himself with spies and personal agents, and

¹ There is a mixture of contempt and fear in the story told by Count Fedor Golovkine in his memoirs of Emperor Paul, "*La Cour et le Règne de Paul I.*" Paris, 1905, p. 103. According to Golovkine, Catharine warned Paul, by the mouth of her favorite Panine, that he was her illegitimate child, and not entitled to succeed her—hence he must abandon all intrigues. For a curious trait that throws light on the shameful immorality of contemporary Northern courts, see *op. cit.*, pp. 383-384.

arrived at the throne well posted with notes as to the principal personages at the court of his mother Catharine. His accession was the signal for a reversing of the régime of the dead Empress. He had always been troubled as to his father's death and shown himself something of a Hamlet. Almost his first act was to cause the disinterment of the body of Peter III., that had been ignobly buried in the cemetery of the convent of St. Alexander Nevsky. The remains of the Emperor were re-interred in a catafalque and placed beside those of Catharine. Prince Orloff, the alleged murderer of Peter III., and his accomplice, Bariatinski, were compelled to figure prominently in the ceremonies by which the memory of Peter was rehabilitated; afterward they were exiled. Paul took a delight in undoing the work of Catharine or her advisers, and as an earnest of this temper ordered the destruction of the splendid monument that Catharine had built over the remains of Potemkin. In general he was a violent reactionary. The French Revolution aroused in him feelings of detestation, and while he lived there was an end of the French domination in St. Petersburg; not only the arts and letters of France were tabooed, but especially the political ideas and institutions of the Republic. Native Russian costumes and habits were resurrected, and all the powers of autocracy set in motion in order to undo in Russian society the work of his bold and unprincipled mother. The Russian capital was quickly transformed and began to look more like Moscow or "Lord Novgorod" than Paris. Paul declared himself the protector of the fallen monarchs of Europe and even went so far as to offer (1796) a refuge to Pius VI.² What his reception would have been may be gathered from the hatred always shown the Papacy by Platon, the Archbishop of Moscow. He declared that the Popes were a succession of Anti-Christes and the Cardinals agents of the devil.³ The Emperor was, after all, profoundly religious by nature; he loved the ceremonies of the Church, and was occasionally moved to tears by the discourses of his metropolitan, whom he afterwards treated quite unceremoniously. In the fragment of personal memoirs of Count Golovkine, just published, there is a curious trait of Cæsaropapism that recalls the well-known story of Maximilian I. and his plan to become at once emperor, pope and saint.

There took place about this time (1797) an affair that was kept quiet, but which caused men to reflect. The Emperor made up his mind that as head of the Church he would say Mass. Not daring to commit so great an innovation in the capital, he resolved to say his first Mass at Kasan, whither he was then going. The costliest vestments were made for him. He meant

² The Pope was solicited to go to St. Petersburg, but excused himself on the plea of his great age, the climate and the inconvenience of an existence in the heart of a schismatic church. Golovkine, *op. cit.*, p. 138.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 141.

also to become the confessor of his family and his ministers. With admirable presence of mind, the Synod saved him from these follies. At the first mention of his design no surprise was shown, though all were thunder-struck; at the same time it was explained to him that the canons of the Greek Church forbade the celebration of Mass by a priest who had been twice married. He had not thought of this, and, as he dared not or did not wish to change the laws concerning the priesthood, he gave up his project. He consoled himself, however, by putting on, at his prayers, a little short dalmatic of red velvet and embroidered with pearls. His thin and slight figure was certainly a very curious object on such occasions, since he continued to wear at the same time his uniform, long boots, three-cornered hat and powdered queue.⁴

His determination to do ever the contrary of what had been done in the former reign would have inclined him favorably toward the Catholics of his vast domains. He had been favorably impressed by the reception accorded to him by Pius VI. and the Romans on the occasion (1790) of his European voyage while yet only heir-presumptive to the throne of all the Russias. He renewed the relations of the Empire with the Holy See and received with distinction the Apostolic Nuncio, Lorenzo Litta, formerly Nuncio at Warsaw and a member of one of the most distinguished families of Northern Italy. By the bull *Maximis undique pressi* (October 16, 1798) Pius VI. reorganized the diocesan system of the Catholics of Russia. To the United Greeks were allotted the three dioceses of Polock, Luck and Brzesc; to the Latins the sees of Mohilev (metropolitan), Samogitia, Wilna, Luck, Kamieniec and Minsk. As a special favor the Catholics of the Empire were freed from the jurisdiction of the College of Justice, a purely Greek ecclesiastical court. In its place was created a Roman Catholic College of Justice, or Supreme Council, the presidency of which was accorded to Siestrenczewicz, the metropolitan of Mohilev. This is the origin of the ecclesiastical tribunal known as the "Catholic College" of St. Petersburg, which has been often recast, but has never ceased to afflict the consciences of all Russian subjects who acknowledge the spiritual supremacy of the Holy See. For the present, the mere fact that its action was dominated and directed by the metropolitan of Mohilev could inspire only fear and suspicion among all Catholic Ruthenians, Lithuanians and Poles. It was not long before Siestrenczewicz obtained the dismissal of the Papal Nuncio, and shortly afterward an ukase (November 3, 1798) that placed all Catholic religious orders within the episcopal jurisdiction of Mohilev. Had Paul obeyed his original good impulses, it would have needed no new laws to restore peace and security to so many millions of his troubled subjects; it would have been sufficient to execute the promises, edicts and treaties of Catharine. But of what avail were the parchments of the dead Empress so long as the evil genius of Catholicism lived and continued to apply against its

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 149-150.

adherents all the cunning of ancient Byzantium, all the maxims of the royal Protestantism of Prussia and all the jealous fetters of Austrian Febronianism? It seemed as though the adverse fates of Russian Catholicism had conspired to meet in the brain of one man and to prolong his odious existence in such a way that Peter the Great and Nicholas I. might converse with one another as to the best means of destroying the authority of Rome within the limits of the new Russia. In his quality of president of the Roman Catholic College of Justice the metropolitan of Mohilev united in his own hands the entire administration of Russian Catholicism. There was no appeal save to himself, the final control reserved to the imperial senate being at all times unlikely to favor the interests of Catholicism. Siestrenczewicz was thus in possession of a kind of patriarchate from which all action of the Holy See was carefully excluded. Such a situation was destined to call forth protest from the independent representatives of Catholicism still to be found in Russia. The religious orders, notably the Jesuits, appealed to the Czar against the travesty of justice represented by the presence of Siestrenczewicz at the head of the new College of Justice; he was obliged to hand in his resignation and retire to his diocese. His place was taken by his coadjutor, Benislawski. This ex-Jesuit remained but a short time at the head of the department, long enough, however, to bring its administration into conformity with the spirit of the Church. He obtained from Paul I. the restitution of the property of the Jesuits. They were given charge of the Catholics in St. Petersburg, and were permitted to open schools and colleges in any part of Russia. Finally the Society of Jesus was restored in Russia (March 7, 1801) by Pius VII., at the request of the Czar. A few days later (March 23) the latter was murdered by conspirators headed by the German barons Pahlen and Benignsen. His mutable impetuous temper made even his wife and heir fear for their personal safety; his costly foreign wars had affected the revenues of the Russian nobility and the welfare of the State; the glorious career of his great general Suwarow had ended in such defeats as Zürich and Bergen; his own unselfish principles had caused his betrayal by Austria and England, and the loss of many thousand Russian lives to whom the interests of Europe were of little importance; he was even now thinking of moving like a new Alexander to the conquest of India, as an adequate revenge for the treason of England in his regard. It seemed that the hour of this terrible dreamer had come. He was strangled obscurely in a hand-to-hand conflict with his assailants, to the infinite disgust of his new-found friend, Bonaparte, and the incredible joy of his former ally, England.

II.

The reign of Alexander I. (1801-1825) is in many ways typical of all Russian life and thought in the nineteenth century. On the one hand we see the noblest aspirations and efforts for the improvement of Russian humanity, and on the other a return to the sternest autocracy. The Emperor began his career under the guidance of such liberal minds as Adam Czartoryski, Nowossiltzof and Stroganof, friends of his youth, with whom he had often discussed the creation of a free and intelligent Russia. It was allowed to speak of rights and duties; the civil administration underwent many reforms in a modern sense; the emancipation of the serfs was taken up with earnestness; public instruction was planned on a broad scale and in a practical manner. It seemed as though a new life had begun to pulsate in the veins of the sons of Russ.⁵

The son of a village pope, Speranskij, who had risen from the office of an ecclesiastical instructor to the highest place in the Empire, was long the mentor of the Emperor and the executor of his liberal ideas. He dominates the first half of the reign of Alexander—when he fell (1812) a new era began, the period of reaction.⁶ The decisive share of Russia in the great coalitions against Napoleon had developed the ever-latent Cæsarism of the Russian ruler, and also a mystical feeling of solicitude and responsibility for a universal peace, to be accomplished by measures of reaction and oppression. clearly on the minds of his new counsellors, and with the new consciousness came also the determination to root out all Western forces, all Latin centres of resistance or interference. War and military colonization were opening up extensive regions for the native Russians to enter upon and civilize after their own semi-barbarian Muscovite notions.⁷ The first germs of political panslavism were planted, and the policy inaugurated that was to lead Russia to the forefront of universal domination. The old established German influence that had dominated in the latter half of the eighteenth century, and the shorter-lived French ascendancy of the reign of

⁵ "Mémoires et Correspondance du Prince Adam Czartoryski," Paris, 1887, 2 vols., and the "Mémoires de La Harpe," Paris, 1864; Bogdanovitch, "History of Alexander I.," St. Petersburg, 1869-1871, 6 vols. (Russian); Schnitzler, "Histoire Intime de la Russie sous les empereurs Alexandre et Nicolas," 2 vols., Paris, 1847; Pypine, "The Intellectual Movement Under Alexander I.," St. Petersburg, 1885 (Russian).

⁶ Speranski, "Lettres à Sotlichine (1818 ff), à Zeir (1814-1817)," St. Petersburg, 1870; Korff, "Life of Count Speranski," 2 vols., 1861 (Russian), St. Petersburg.

⁷ For the military colonies of Araktschejewf, see Rambaud, "Histoire de la Russie," Paris, 1884, c. 35.

Catharine, were doomed to extinction. The House of Romanoff was to become the leader of the Russian masses, to express and execute autocratically the unconscious Russian idea, even as a Titus or a Trajan stood for the purposes of the Roman people. No doubt there were real forces of a popular character behind all this, **vague and unclear aspirations of a strong race**, raw and undeveloped, emotional and religious, yet multitudinous, and placed advantageously on the vast marches between Europe and the remotest Orient. It had done great things in conflict with the upstart Latin Cæsar; it had fired Moscow and forced the disastrous passage of the Beresina; it had subdued and trained Cossack and Tartar and nameless Oriental hordes; it had found voices of incredible eloquence and pathos, of fresh native grace and distinction, to tell the world of Europe what the Slav thought and hoped; it had looked on the old and the new constitutions of Europe as models exposed in open market, and finally rejected them all, in the hope of adapting its immemorial institutions to the new conditions of life. The indecision of Paul and of the youthful Alexander was pushed aside by such great domestic forces and in its place was set up a Slav world-purpose that really began with Nicholas II. (1825), and has been but now right vigorously challenged and balked by the little brown men of Nippon. We may recall once more that it is scarcely more than a century since Emperor Paul and Napoleon conceived (1801) the "grand plan" by which Russian and French armies were to penetrate into India and overthrow the rule of England. It would seem as though divine providence were bent on compelling an internal renovation of Old Muscovy before she is allowed to set up as the ideal political force among us moderns. Again and again, by fair means and foul, has "Adam Bear" striven to consolidate in the Far Orient the work of the marvelous Macedonian boy-conqueror, and as often has he been driven back. It seems probable, now, that when the "Russian God" again summons his people to overflow Eastward, it will be with a chastened spirit and a healthier sense of the Slav's political place and capacities.

We may return from this digression with the remark that a small percentage of the Russian clergy, the educated monastic element, was largely responsible for the frightful injustices henceforth committed against Roman Catholicism throughout the Russian dominions. No doubt the anti-Romanism of Northern Germany—Encyclopedist hatred, Bavarian Illuminism and Austrian Febronianism—had contributed powerfully to the Russian distrust and contempt of genuine Catholicism. But all these influences found a receptive and favorable atmosphere among ecclesiastics who had for many centuries been under the baleful influence of the Greek clergy of

Constantinople. What that meant is readily understood by every student of the documentary sources of the Greek Schism from Photius to the Council of Florence. The humiliation of the patriarch Nikon (1658-1667) and the extinction of the patriarchal power at Moscow (1700) marked the acme of Slavic Erastianism; henceforth the Russian Church is dormant. A vigorous Christian faith lives on and produces signs and evidences of spiritual life and health. But order, progress, originality, independence are lacking; the true bulwark of popular liberty is overthrown and the meanest of political forces, a salaried and selfish bureaucracy, sets its heel on the necks of the people, silences all free speech and criticism and furnishes the nineteenth century with a spectacle of oppression that Caligula might have imitated with envy. The estates of the Russian Church were confiscated by Catharine in 1764; in return a salary has since then been paid by the government to every ecclesiastic, with the result that the whole order has long since ceased to feel any noble stirrings of independence or any sense of original God-given responsibility for the political or social welfare of the people.⁸ Did Gregory VII. need a justification for the resounding defeat he inflicted on Western Cæsarism he would find it in the spectacle of the miserable Russian "pope" of to-day and the servile monasticism of the Empire whose highest ambition is to be the political tool of St. Petersburg at Mount Athos or Jerusalem, New York or San Francisco.

III.

By an ukase of November 13, 1801, Siestrenczewicz had obtained from Alexander a definitive reorganization of the Roman Catholic College of Justice on lines which made it henceforth the counter-

⁸ If we pass to the moral authority, to the influence of the Bishops, we shall not be wrong in affirming that it is almost nil. As to pastoral letters, they are never heard of. The discourses they pronounce on solemn occasions no one cares about. They can be haughty in presence of their clergy, can surround themselves with a certain pomp, demand of their inferiors excessive marks of respect, and, alas, are no bolder or more independent in the presence of the great. They know not how to unite Christian humility with sacerdotal firmness; people never hear them speak with an evangelic liberty. Their action on minds, on society, is nil. They seem to be Bishops only for the purpose of figuring in the pomps of the divine office. The ceremonies of worship in the Oriental rite have, it is true, an incomparable majesty; in the Russian Church they are performed with a rare perfection. The voice of chanters lends them a marvelous charm, and all this, as a whole, acquires completeness only by the presidency of the Bishop. This is great; this is fine. But these splendors would make no less impression if the Bishop, on laying aside his magnificent ornaments, remained a Bishop still; if he knew how to raise his voice to instruct the people, to denounce abuses and to defend God's rights on earth and those of the Church, of justice, of the humble and lowly.—Gagarin, "The Russian Church," London, 1872, pp. 194-195.

part of the Holy Synod itself, *i. e.*, a perfect machine for the civil domination of the Catholic Church in the Czar's domains. It was in vain that the Catholic Bishops protested (1804); the momentary yielding of Alexander was followed by hateful suggestions of Siestrenczewicz that the Emperor was modifying the imperial constitution in favor of a Latin power (Rome). The new department was confirmed and its administration turned over finally to the boldest ecclesiastical traitor of the century. He had sought to be a Cardinal; he was now to all intents and purposes an independent patriarch. He filled this governing board of Russian Catholicism with his own creatures, men said to have been devoid of religious morality or conscience; he excluded at the same time all men of virtue and placed in it two dissolute monks, one of whom, the Franciscan Stankiewicz, soon abandoned Catholicism and took a wife publicly in St. Petersburg. Among the members was the Protestant brother of Siestrenczewicz, who, it will be remembered, was a convert. Since then the presence of Protestants in this standing committee on Catholic affairs in Russia has become a tradition. When Pius VII., in the interests of the oppressed Catholics of Russia, sent the legate Tommaso Arezzo to St. Petersburg (1802) the Archbishop of Mohilev procured his dismissal; the presence of a Papal agent would have seriously interfered with the new patriarchal status of Siestrenczewicz. At the same time the latter caused the Emperor to issue an order forbidding Siestrenczewicz or any other Catholic Bishop to hold any communication with Rome. In this act of violence he had the coöperation of the famous Protestant pietist Frau von Krüdener, under whose influence the Emperor had come. A Russian envoy was stationed at Rome (1803), through whose hands all the Catholic affairs of Russia must pass. In 1804 the Russian chancery complimented the Archbishop of Mohilev on his fidelity in executing the imperial will:

The habitual sagacity of Your Excellency and your profound sense of duty, proven by your constant fidelity during a long pastoral life, do not permit us to doubt that you will execute with punctuality the wishes of His Majesty. Thereby you will justify the high esteem in which Your Excellency is held because of your faithful performance of the duties of a good and loyal citizen.

A month later (August, 1804) the Emperor broke off all relations with Rome and practically made the Archbishop of Mohilev the patriarch of all Russian Catholics. He proceeded at once to establish himself as the willing tool of Russian autocracy, but met with a decided opposition from the remaining Catholic Bishops, who insisted firmly on the obedience due to the Holy See and the absolute impossibility of any religious administration of Catholicism whence the former was excluded. In order to overcome the righteous opposition of his brethren Siestrenczewicz suggested to

the imperial chancery a further manipulation of the standing committee on Catholic affairs. Hitherto the six Latin dioceses of Russia had chosen every three years six assessors who, together with the imperial appointees, constituted the "College of Justice" or governing board of Russian Catholicism. Siestrenczewicz proposed to reduce the number of assessors and to withdraw from the dioceses all right of appointment; henceforth the board, diminished by one-half, would be appointed directly and solely by the Czar.

In the above mentioned memoir addressed to Prince Lopouchine, Minister of Justice, and, as we shall see, destined to be kept secret, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Mohilev delivers himself as follows:

These elective members are ignorant as a rule of the civil legislation of the empire; they are also unacquainted with the habits of imperial administration, and are almost entirely unacquainted with the Russian language. The result of all this is seen in the disorder and difficulty that accompany the administration of religious affairs. We may say of these six elective assessors that they are a kind of residents or protectors of all kinds of ancient rights and privileges obtained from Rome. They are not real members of an imperial committee. These men imagine that if they defend the various Roman institutions and privileges they will be held in higher honor by the people of their dioceses than if they execute the laws of Russia. . . . I must say frankly to Your Highness that these six members are nominated according to the imperial decrees of 1800-1801, all of which are contrary to former decrees and to the rules of 1795 for the government of the Catholic clergy. These later decrees are a result of the intrigues and trickery of the monks, whose constant aim it is to have in the college representatives of their own way of thinking. Thereby they hope to maintain the ancient ecclesiastical rights and institutions. We read, for instance, in those decrees that are subsequent to the ancient ukases: "The councils shall be guided in all things according to their own specific rules." Now, these rules dispense them from all submission to any authority other than that of their own superiors. In this way they dispose of considerable ecclesiastical wealth, for which they are accountable and responsible to no one."

Siestrenczewicz dared now to take a further step. To the same memoir he added a proposal for a new constitution to be imposed on the Catholic clergy of Russia. It is nothing less than a revolutionary act, and may be looked on as the first measure of execution of the abominable plans by which the fortune of Catholicism in Russia was all but ruined in the succeeding reigns.

As to the second object (of this memoir)—that is, the proposed constitution for the Roman Catholic clergy—I make known to your Highness that in the composition of this plan I have kept constantly in view the laws and decrees of Russia from 1773 to 1800. The unvarying spirit of this legislation contemplates the government of the Roman Catholic clergy quite along the lines of that which is provided for the State clergy, according to the same imperial legislation, and without any special exemption or any kind of privilege contrary to the laws of the empire. This legislation further contemplates the retention of the supreme ecclesiastical authority in the hands of the diocesan Bishop. Each one is to direct in his diocese the entire clergy, both secular and regular, and is to render an account of his administration only to the supreme tribunal for Catholic affairs.

The plan which I have drawn up is not such as one might expect from a Roman Bishop, but rather such as a faithful subject ought to propose. Hence, in order to avoid the false interpretations which some ecclesiastics might make of it, on the supposition that the changes thereby effected in the various rules, institutions and privileges obtained by the different dioceses are in some way a violation of religion itself, I humbly beg your Highness, in case you think

it necessary to demand from me the proposed constitution, that it should be communicated to no one else. Your Highness may add to my plan whatever you think useful. You are free also to correct it and, if you desire, to suppress it.

I may state to your Highness that the discontent manifested by badly trained ecclesiastics arises from the fact that *I have at all times tried to guide the clergy according to those ukases of the late Czarina, of blessed memory, and the late Czar*, which were issued in 1795, and not according to the Roman institutions and privileges obtained at different epochs, and which are entirely intolerable in a well organized state, etc., etc. St. Petersburg, October 29, 1806.

In detail the new constitution was the legislation of Catharine in its principal measures, only maliciously recast and arranged by a Roman Catholic Archbishop, who had received from the Holy See the very metropolitan authority by which he was enabled to consummate his daring treason. Among other things he suppressed all canonical collation to benefices and extinguished every trace of independence and autonomy on the part of the religious orders. The chief point of the proposed constitution was the suppression of all appeals to Rome on the plea that by virtue of his canonical institution the metropolitan of Mohilev possessed powers identical with those of the Pope!

Although Siestrenczewicz had asked the Minister to keep secret the contemplated measure, a copy of it made its way into faithful hands. Szantyr, a member of the College, reached the procurator of the Holy Synod, Prince Galitzin, with the complaints of his fellow-Catholics and made it clear that such legislation was equivalent to the extinction of Roman Catholicism. Galitzin was honorable enough to lay these complaints before Alexander, who was a just and kindly man when not deceived by intrigues or blinded by suspicions purposely aroused and nourished. As a matter of fact, the propositions of Siestrenczewicz were abandoned and Catholicism in Russia was saved from the odious yoke of hopeless slavery that its own chief representative had fashioned for it. This did not prevent him from governing in open and contemptuous disregard of the constitutional rights of the other members of the "College;" his known subserviency won only too easily bureaucratic toleration in matters that turned to the disadvantage of Rome and her religion. In particular his laxity in the granting of divorces made him still more odious in the eyes both of Catholics and non-Catholics.

As time wore on the Jesuits became a special object of dislike to Siestrenczewicz. In Russia as in Prussia the civil authority had forbidden the proclamation of the bull of Clement XIV. that dissolved the society. Catharine did not allow its publication even in the Polish provinces, not that she was moved by any interests of Catholicism, but for the sake of education, which would have suffered by the closing of the numerous schools conducted by the Society. She needed them, moreover, for the pacification of a

Catholic population yet smarting under grievous wrongs done by her and whose compulsory apostasy she was yet unable to undertake. She even resisted the demands of the Holy See for the execution of the bull. The Jesuits took the oath of fidelity, after the seizure of White Russia in September, 1772, and were treated thenceforth with distinction and even with partiality. They were assured that the rights of Catholicism would be respected and that they might continue to observe the rules of their order. Siestrenciewicz followed in the footsteps of his imperial mistress, and even permitted the opening of a Jesuit novitiate in 1780. Nor did his attitude change while Paul I. lived. The Emperor was rather favorable to the Society and obtained from Pius VII. (1801) their formal reestablishment in Russia.

The slumbering dislike of Alexander for the Society broke out in 1815. By a decree of December 16 the Jesuit college at St. Petersburg was closed and all members of the society were expelled from that city and from Moscow. No accusation or process, but swift and summary expulsion was their lot. All were arrested in the night of December 22-23, 1815 (January 3-4, 1816), and sent off to Polotzk, whence they were conducted across the frontier. In the homiletic ukase of banishment they are charged with ingratitude, pride and a disturbing spirit. It is said that they undertook to overthrow the immemorial Russian orthodoxy, to sow discord in families and fill the State with disunion, etc. In fact, they had made some remarkable conversions among the better class of Russians, and the haughty ecclesiasticism of Russia had taken umbrage, even begun to tremble.⁹ Four years later (1820) they were expelled from Poland, and it was expressly stated that they should never, under any pretext or name, return to the Empire. The principal agent of their disgrace and expulsion was their own co-religionist, Siestrenciewicz, who saw in them only troublesome spectators of his iniquity. He had already (1810) done his best, but in vain, to prevent the nomination of a general in succession to Fr. Gruber, but had been defeated with the aid of Prince Galitzin. Count De Maistre is a sufficient witness of this accusation.

"The true author," he says, "of this great wrong¹⁰ is our wretched felon of an Archbishop, a disguised Protestant. Were I to shake that man's hand I would put on a cowhide glove."

The Protestant temper of Siestrenciewicz showed very clearly in his relations with the propaganda of the Bible Society. Since 1812 the London Society had been making vigorous headway in Russia and eventually distributed nearly 900,000 copies of the Bible, with-

⁹ See the interesting narrative, "*Les Jésuites en Russie, récit d'un Jésuite de la Russie blanche*," Paris, 1872.

¹⁰ Correspondance diplomatique, II., 305.

out note or comment, in all parts of that vast Empire, besides causing the Bible to be translated into some twenty vernaculars. It had also established nearly three hundred branches. This un-Catholic and often anti-Catholic enterprise appealed to so un-Catholic a man as Siestrenczewicz, especially as in the beginning Emperor Alexander was not opposed to the methods and the spirit of the colporteurs. The Archbishop of Mohilev went farther; in a pastoral letter he falsified, with true Byzantine audacity, a decree of the Council of Trent and an almost contemporary letter of Pius VI. For this he was severely reproached by Pius VII. in a letter of September 3, 1816, something that concerned him less than Alexander's contemporary withdrawal of his favor from the proselytizing endeavors of the Bible Society. The Pope's arguments touched the Emperor; he caused the brief to be made public and expelled the agents of the Society.

One of the grievous wounds of Polish society in the eighteenth century had been the ease and frequency of divorce. It is said that only in England was divorce then so common. The nobles and the wealthy were, of course, the principal sinners; as late as 1840 it is stated that every year the small diocese of Minsk could show from two to three hundred divorces. When Alexander sought (1825), at the Diet of Warsaw, the abrogation of civil marriage he was strongly opposed by the Polish nobility, and put his will through only with difficulty and with the aid of the episcopate. Yet the newly adopted Code Civil of Napoleon was in open opposition to the rights of the Church and contradicted formally the provisions of the Council of Trent. Siestrenczewicz made no effort to withstand this product of license and infidelity; on the contrary, his venal court continued to encourage such appeals and gave at all times a wretched example to lesser diocesan chanceries.

The failure of Napoleon, apropos of the Russian campaign (1813), to realize the hopes aroused by his short-lived creation of the Grand Duchy of Warsaw (1796-1813) was followed by the re-incorporation with the Russian state of a multitude of Poles who had been hoping in the last two decades for the restoration of the ancient kingdom. The constitution of 1815 guaranteed the exercise of the Catholic religion, and in 1817 the Polish hierarchy was reorganized by Pius VII. Warsaw was made an archiepiscopal see with seven suffragans. The Uniats had still their see of Chelm, with its two hundred parishes. The Emperor, however, continued to put obstacles in the way of communication with Rome, and no young Pole was allowed to visit a foreign university without special permission. Alexander, however, was not unfriendly to Poland; her sons, not without reason, expected at one time the restoration by him of the

venerable "Respublica." Perhaps the spread in his own dominions by the returned soldiers of political liberalism, the growth of secret societies, the increase of patriotic literature and the unhealthy religious atmosphere that surrounded him, were responsible for the abandonment of the noble ideas that he had once entertained and discussed with Adam Czartoryski, and which that noble Pole enshrined for posterity in his famous castle of Pulawy among the relics of his country's fame and greatness. Certainly he was a truer "Pan Tadeusz" than Napoleon, and might have earned, under better auspices, the immortality that Mickiewicz had the bestowal of. In the very year of his death (1825) he ordered the construction of two Catholic churches, one for the Uniat Ruthenians at St. Petersburg, the other for Latin Catholics at Tsarkoe-Selo. The Uniats, moreover, had increased notably in his reign. In 1801 they were 1,398,048; in 1825 they had reached the figure of 1,427,359, an increase kept up until 1834, when they were 1,504,278.

IV.

Did Alexander I. die a Roman Catholic? The evidence for this assertion is not slight or contemptible. In his early youth he seems to have been influenced against Christianity by his French tutor, Laharpe. But the conflagration of Moscow (1812) made a great change in him; thenceforth he resolved to conduct his high office on the most elevated Christian principles. At the Congress of Verona he is reported to have declared that God did not give him an army of 800,000 men for purposes of mere human ambition, but to restore religion, morality and justice to their proper place and to establish anew the reign of order. He became a man of prayer and meditation. It is true that he fell under the influence of German Pietism through Frau von Krüdener, and of the Illuminati through Nicholas Bergasse and Jung-Stilling. But, on the other hand, he was accessible to the religious influence of Madame Swetchine and others of the little coterie of Russian converts to Catholicism. Joseph de Maistre had not lived in vain at the court of St. Petersburg; the elevated concept of the Church and the Pope that shines from that great statesman's pages must have been often laid before Alexander. The Emperor had also met Cardinal Consalvi at London and Vienna, not to speak of many noble and religious émigrés who made Russia their home in those troubled years. Large religious ideas led him to the famous scheme of the Holy Alliance with Prussia and Austria that was supposed to establish compulsory peace on the basis of the Christian Scriptures. The Bible Societies and even the Quakers won a temporary or occa-

sional approval from him; he was an emotional Slav, and as such accessible to profound mystical considerations. Religious unity is the condition of spiritual peace, and it is not unreasonable to suppose that this great warrior, turned an apostle of peace, should come to see that the first condition of lasting religious peace was the restoration of ancient concord. It is said that at the Congress of Aachen (1817) he conversed at length on the Catholic religion with Müllejans, the Catholic pastor of the neighboring village of Würfelen. He sent a donation to the Catholic curé at Geneva and expressed his pleasure that the Holy Father was contented with this gift. In September, 1822, he conversed for two hours on religious subjects with the holy priest Alexander von Hohenlohe. At the end he fell on his knees before the good priest and rising embraced him tenderly. Later he invited him to St. Petersburg, where he frequently saw him. When Alexander was at Vienna in 1822 his mother begged him not to go to Rome, as though she feared the influence of the Father of Christendom. When his brother Constantine married a Catholic Princess of Polish birth he renounced his birthright in favor of his younger brother, Nicholas (II.). Alexander did not make this known officially; it is possible that he meant to wait and see what would follow from his own proposed conversion. If that were accepted by the people Constantine might still reign over Russia.

Alexander was fond of the Piedmontese nobleman, Count Michaud. Moroni states in his "Dizionario" that in 1825 this gentleman was sent by Alexander to Leo XII. with the secret announcement of the imperial intention to put an end to the schism of his people and abjure the errors of Photius, even at the price of martyrdom. Count Michaud was to request of the Holy Father that he send to St. Petersburg a trustworthy religious, either a Camoldolese or a Franciscan. The first choice of the Pope fell on Mauro Capellari, later Gregory XVI., and then on the Franciscan (later Cardinal) Orioli. While the latter was getting ready for his journey the news came that the Emperor had passed away (November 19—December 1, 1825) at Taganrog, in Southern Russia. Moroni asserts (lix., 110, and xxxviii., 57) that he had this information from the lips of Gregory, who also told him that for a certainty Alexander I. had died a Catholic death. In 1844 the Prince de Polignac asserted that he had seen at Paris in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs a despatch saying that Alexander had confessed to a Roman Catholic priest, abjured the Greek Schism and received the last sacraments. It is possible that Fedotof, the Queen's confessor, who attended him, was himself a crypto-Catholic. One is naturally reminded of the death-bed conversion of Charles II., the hurried

visit of the Benedictine Huddlesfield and the devotion of the Duke of York. It is said that when leaving St. Petersburg Alexander bade the Dominicans keep ready an apartment for a priest who would come from Rome. During his stay in Poland he paid a nocturnal visit to a Dominican church and had the Blessed Sacrament exposed for the satisfaction of his devotion. It is said also that the Venerable Anna Maria Taigi beheld in her "mystic sun" that the Emperor had died a Catholic death and was in Purgatory. The narrative of Moroni is confirmed by a written statement (August 22, 1841) of the Count d'Escarène, to the effect that Count Michaud had related to him the fact of his mission to Leo XII. Father Gagarin, a distinguished Russian Jesuit and a scholarly writer on Russian affairs, states that he knew a respectable man to whom Count Michaud had related the same. Gagarin also says that it was a Greek Uniat monk who heard the confession of Alexander on his death-bed. It seems certain that there are at Rome and elsewhere authentic documents that confirm the death of the Emperor in the unity of the Roman Church.¹¹

V.

Though Siestrenczewicz died in communion with the Apostolic See, he had accomplished, as far as in him lay, the separation of Roman Catholicism in Russia from its rightful head and guide. He was filled with the spirit of schism, and during his too long life abetted all its principles and executed all its designs. He might have imitated a Basil before Modestus, and exhibited a true Bishop to men who had never seen one, or withstood the tyranny of Russian bureaucracy as Eusebius of Vercelli and Dionysius of Milan withstood Constantius when he declared that he was their canon law. Instead of giving full play to the intrinsic power of resistance that yet existed among the Ruthenian and Latin Catholics of Russia he paralyzed all their ardor, misdirected all their efforts, suppressed all their protests, laid bare all their affection for Rome to the worst enemy of Rome. He had only to look about him to behold what ravages had been worked among the Russian clergy by the civil domination of the Czars. It seems as if God had permitted the unspeakable results we yet behold as an eternal warning to the Latin Church of what state control means, and an eternal incitement to enter on the way of martyrdom rather than accept the yoke of secular protection and favor when coupled with authoritative control.¹²

¹¹ Moroni, "Dizionario," LIX., 110; XXXVIII., 57; "Civiltà Cattolica (ninth series), XII., 349-352; "Etudes Religieuses," July, 1877, 26-50.

¹² Tondini, "The Pope of Rome and the Popes of the Oriental Orthodox

The Archbishop of Mohilev was in reality a Prussianized official of the Holy Synod at St. Petersburg for the suppression of all religious liberty among Russian Catholics of either rite. The conquerors and oppressors of these populations knew too well how profoundly religious the latter were and how fierce would be their resistance to the "benevolent assimilation" contemplated, were they to be left in living contact with the Catholicism of Europe. Hence the cunning plan of cutting the nerve of unity and then overthrowing them at intervals and when occasion offered. Poland made an heroic resistance; the fate of the Uniats remains to be told. It is only when we look upon the pitiable internal condition of Russia that we understand the true significance of St. Anselm of Canterbury and St. Thomas à Becket and a hundred other men of the mediæval world who withstood the contemporary tyrant and suffered, that coming generations might not perish spiritually. The ignorance and apathy of the unhappy Russian peasantry are directly traceable to their clergy, whose only excuse is that they are yet the public serfs of the Russian State. On all sides are heard to-day the voices of Russian men and women demanding that an end be put to their horrible wrongs. Only the voices of the clergy are dumb. No Bishop speaks from his monastic retreat, and no village priest dare open his mouth were he fitted to do so. The monastic clergy despises the poor and brutalized secular clergy, and the latter pay back contempt with hatred. No Bishop dare consult with another Bishop, and in the episcopal committee that governs in minute detail the Russian Church the sole real power is the lay representative of the Czar. Were the alleged spiritual tyranny of Rome to be multiplied a hundredfold it would not equal that which for two centuries has been exercised immediately on every Russian, and for a still longer time has hampered the growth of all true religion. All the rich treasures that lie in the natural development of ecclesiastical personality, *i. e.*, independence of judgment, initiative, active sympathy, progress and development, are wasted. From beginning to end ecclesiastical life in Russia is a professional *carriera*, like that of a notary or a civil servant. "Would you have me

Church," London, 1871, and Gagarin, *op. cit. passim*. cf. also "Of the White and the Black Clergy of Russia," Leipzig, 1866 (Russian), for the details of the spiritual ruin of Russia. The reader may also consult "The Patriarch and the Tzar—Replies of the Humble Nikon by the Mercy of God, Patriarch of Moscow," London, 1871. That the condition of the Russian clergy under the State domination has not changed may be seen from many books of travel, particularly from Wallace's "Russia," London, 1881: c. IV. "The Village Priest," pp. 50-67, and c. XXVII, pp. 421-434. This writer is not unfavorable to Russia, and was afforded every facility during six years for the composition of his work. In more than one place he manifests a certain jealousy of Catholic ecclesiastical independence.

become like the Archbishop of Moscow or the Archbishop of Canterbury?" said Leo XIII. one day to a prominent Archbishop of the United States, apropos of his relations with the Italian Government. What surer commentary on the historical steps that reduced these ecclesiastics from their free and independent status to the rank of civil agents? In the wake of civil control of ecclesiastical life follow always ambition and corruption. Secularism of every kind invades the sanctuary.¹⁸ The Gospel of Jesus and the examples of His saints are made vain or serve only the vices they openly condemn. Nepotism becomes an institution, and the civil and ecclesiastical prizes are placed on one level to be struggled for with an equal human ardor of rivalry. Thus the vanquished paganism of ancient life returns to power, the distinction of temporal and spiritual is lost or overlaid, and soon the multitudes envelop in a

¹⁸ It may not be out of place to quote here the words of an estimable historian of the Tudor religious policy, that, *mutatis mutandis*, has been adopted by Russia since Peter the Great:

"Under Henry VIII. the true liberties and independence of the Church, as they had been set forth afresh by Magna Charta, were successfully destroyed. These fell with the fall of the monasteries and their inmates, and became extinct with the old and estimable race of Bishops and clergy. The iron will of a cruel despot, whom anger and covetousness alternately excited to action, with the Machiavellian policy of his selfish advisers, soon brought all this evil to pass. Parliaments and parliament-men, new nobles and pinchbeck knights of the shires were as abjectly subservient to the impetuous monarch as the judges themselves. Old laws were interpreted and new enactments were passed with little regard to aught else than the cruel king's shifting whims. Ofttimes, in the interpretation of such oppressive laws, every principle of truth and justice, of right and fair play was set at naught, so that under this royal house nothing less than the subversion of the ancient Constitution of England was successfully effected. The malign influence of these changes and such as these can be clearly traced, and are practically energizing still. The overthrow of lawful ecclesiastical authority, by denuding the Courts of Canterbury and York of their spiritual character (neither by any rational conception nor reasonable possibility being final courts), made those of a local character unrespected and inefficient; while some of these diocesan courts became at once, and have remained ever since the Tudor age, mere nests of corruption, and little else than sources of revenue to those who were appointed to farm them. The granting of licenses was a prolific and well-worked mine of ready money for their hungry officials. In this and in other changes evil principles were then deliberately scattered and rooted, and still live, while, even in the present generation, a fresh crop of rotten fruit may be expected to be picked up ere long. For the destruction of Church authority, a fair tree cut down, as it were, to its very roots, has alarmingly weakened that of the monarch and the magistrate, and tended directly to destroy all authority. An ancient nation consequently, which, with Christian traditions twelve centuries old, expects to be governed wisely and well without the fear of God or the regard of man, and so long only as a mere contract or understanding between governor and governed can be tolerated and made to work, will be very specially and unusually favored if it does not—which God avert!—sooner or later experience a severe fall and court a supreme disaster.—Frederick George Lee, "Edward VI.: Supreme Head," London, 1886, pp. 243-244.

common contempt the principles of Christianity and the lives of its representatives.

Siestrenciewicz let pass a golden opportunity. Perhaps we ought to take into account that he was an ex-courtier, a not too sincere convert from Protestantism, and that he entered on his holy office *per fenestram*, and not by the open and honorable door of vocation. He betrayed every interest of the Roman Church, as though the dominant instinct in him were always that of his native Calvinism. He betrayed every interest of his Polish fatherland, for had he remained loyal to the cause of Catholicism he might have been a powerful intermediary between the patriots of Poland and their conquerors. The vain insurrections of 1831 and 1864 might through him have accomplished their purpose in a peaceful way instead of leaving their nation bleeding on the cross for a whole century. Above all he might have held up to the enslaved State clergy of Russia an example of ecclesiastical independence that would one day quicken them into the successful resistance of martyrdom. The attitude of the Archbishop of Mohilev is all the more inexcusable, as precisely in those years that noble sufferer Pius VII. was giving the world the example of a renewal of the spirit and temper of Martin I. and Gregory VII. Not the least of the trials of Pope Pius was the conduct of Siestrenciewicz. If the Catholics of Ireland were ever tempted to grant the right of veto to the English Government on the occasion of Catholic Emancipation, the career of Siestrenciewicz and its effect upon the hopes of Polish nationality might well have deterred them. The anti-Catholic advisers of Catharine—German, French and Slav—judged only too correctly when they pointed out Siestrenciewicz as the proper man to fasten the yoke on the neck of Poland. For this purpose he was worth to Russia a million of men and countless treasure. He did more damage to Catholicism in Russia than a great heresiarch could have done. The latter would have roused devotion and purified the Church; the Archbishop of Mohilev stood in the pass and held back the vigorous resistance of that glorious nation which had been for so many centuries the bulwark of Europe against Islam. He also prepared the way for the crowning injustice of Russian policy in the nineteenth century—the destruction of the amity and concord that for centuries had existed between the Apostolic See and millions of Russian Catholics. It is he who is primarily responsible for their compulsory apostasy and inscription on the mendacious registers of schism. He was a true disciple of Photius and Michael Cærularius; there is scarcely an evil trait in the lives of these two bad men which he did not parallel—ambition, venality, hypocrisy, forgery, cant, and ecclesiastical treason too

frequent and manifold to relate. On the other hand, Russia has now begun to pay on the dearest scale for the luxury of such Byzantine rascality. Her legions, returning from the far Orient, decimated, humiliated, deceived, will be a ten-fold worse menace to the criminal autocracy than were those victorious veterans of Alexander I., who nearly wrecked the Russian State. There is no native esteem for ecclesiastical authority; the Russian Church seems a pale mitred simulacrum with an icon in one hand and a cross in the other, but without spirit or voice, without initiative, without historical pride, knowing herself only as a department of the imperial chancery, and destined to share its fate, perhaps its abolition. The makers of the New Russia will be moved by the logic of the situation to neglect a church that has become at once an *instrumentum regni* and a scourge of society. The new education will be conducted without her influence and her spirit, for they exist not. The new principles of government will be perforce borrowed from abroad. Russia will this time undergo a cosmopolitan pressure as she once was subservient to Berlin or Paris. Individual right and personal liberty must grow slowly where the urban population is so small compared with the vast masses of ignorant and debased peasantry. Her only chance will be to go to school again to Roman Catholic models and institutions as she did in the latter half of the seventeenth century. She will need again to appeal to the centre of religious life in the West in order to develop some vigor of spirit, some measure of independent life in the spiritual system that holds torpid and stagnant the hearts of her multitudes. Then will come true the vision that hung before the eyes of her dying Alexander, and will be repaired, though tardily, the villainy of the ecclesiastical tools whom she used to her own destruction.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Washington, D. C.

THE ANGLO-ROMAN CONTROVERSY.

I.

TWO recent facts have indirectly turned men's attention once again to the controversy between Catholics and Anglicans—the recent High Anglican appeal to the authority of the first six centuries and Bishop Gore's sixpenny reissue (unrevised) of his "Roman Catholic Claims." A word, therefore, on the subject may not seem unseasonable.

The point, and the whole point, at issue between the contending parties, we shall do well to remember, is wholly and solely the question of authority. Who is the Supreme Head of the Church?

Settle that, and all else follows. Leave that open, and nothing else is of much avail.

Moreover, the discussion is even more limited still. For in England the choice of Supreme Head lies between Pope and King. The Catholic Church acknowledges the Pope; the State Church, the King. Which is right?

In the second part of this paper I propose to draw out the fact that in the State Church it is the King. Here I offer some remarks on the Headship, in the Catholic Church, of the Pope.

Catholics hold the Pope to be Supreme Head of the Catholic Church. That is the unanimous teaching of the whole Catholic world. It was the teaching of our English ancestors from the sixth to the sixteenth century. It was the fundamental doctrine of the English statute law. It was the repeated teaching of the Greeks—a teaching not weakened by their lapses into schism.

The Catholic Church is one visible body throughout the world. A visible body must, *in the same order of life*, have a visible head. That Head is the Pope.

Dr. Gore (chap. ii.) if I understand him aright, would contend that the Church is an aggregation of national bodies—a sort of United States. But an aggregation must have a head. The United States have a President.

This Catholic doctrine is proved from Scripture. It is proved from history. It is proved from experience; for vast as the Catholic Church is and composed of such diverse elements, she nevertheless preserves unity; and she alone preserves unity.

This Papal claim Dr. Gore considers to be an "aggressive," "domineering," "arbitrary," "intolerance" (pp. 95-96). Nay, to make the claim at all is "to become saturated with a spirit of unfaithfulness to historical fact" (p. 13). And he thinks that it was not until "towards the end of the second century that we begin to discern dimly the first beginnings of the claim (on the part of the Popes) to be successors of S. Peter" (p. 95).

"Towards the end of the second century!" Well, that is pretty early! And Christ, we are asked to believe, to correct this lawless state of things, waited fourteen centuries, from the second to the sixteenth, until the coming of Henry VIII., Crumwel and Cranmer! That, surely, is to put a heavy tax on our powers of credulity. What, however, was only "dimly discerned" in the second became plain as a pike-staff in the fifth century. For by that time the whole Christian world unmistakably held to the Papal form of Christianity, the Patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch and Constantinople all recognizing an episcopate equal in order under the Headship of St. Peter's successor, the Pope.

"But," the opponent asks triumphantly, "where during the second century were your Papal Bulls, Papal Encyclicals, Papal Legates, Papal interference in the spiritual affairs of Christendom? That question we answer by asking another: "Where were the Popes themselves?" The answer is obvious. They were in the Catacombs, hiding in sandholes amid a handful of Christians, biding their time until some spy of the Cæsars should hale them into light and to the scaffold. The first thirty Popes were martyrs. That is why, from the Chancellery of the Catacombs, the Popes did not expedite Bulls and Briefs by the couriers of Nero and Trajan, of Decius and Marcus Aurelius.

Still, even in those early days, we are not entirely without evidence for Papal Headship. "We begin dimly to discern towards the end of the second century" the Papal claim to supremacy. May I point out to Dr. Gore that he errs by just a century. We discern that claim, though not "dimly," at the end, not of the second, but of the first century. That claim was made and allowed seven years before the close of the first century—in the year 93,¹ on the occasion of the "Prima Clementis," the first letter of St. Clement, third Pope after St. Peter. Its history is well known.

In the Church at Corinth a small but powerful party rose in rebellion against their spiritual superiors, with the result that some priests were thrust forth from their positions. The schism created such a stir that even the pagans took occasion of it to calumniate the Christian religion. The situation was critical. The Corinthian Church was itself unable to apply a remedy, and therefore the reigning Pope, St. Clement, lifted up his voice to defend the great principle of unity against the spirit of revolt and schism. He wrote to the Corinthians, "confirming them in peace, and renewing their faith and doctrine lately received from the apostle."² In a tone of commanding authority he said: "If any disobey *the words of God spoken through us*, let them know that they will entangle themselves in transgression." And again: "You will cause us joy and exultation if, *obeying the things written by us through the Spirit*, you cut out the lawless passion," etc. Note the expression, "the words of God spoken through us" and "the things written by us through the Spirit." Those phrases read very much like the modern Papal formula, "It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us."

Of this letter Mr. Cruttwell³ writes: "The tone of Clement's language is distinctly that of a superior offering counsel, exhortation

¹ Cf. Harnack, "Altch. Lit.," Pt. II., Vol. I. "Chronologische Tabelle," p. 718.

² Eusebius H. E. v. 6.

³ "A Literary History of Early Christianity," by C. T. Cruttwell, rector of Kribworth, Vol. I., p. 32.

and reproof. The Christian Church of the capital of the world seems to have acknowledged *from the first* a more than local responsibility. This fact gives our epistle a high historical interest as the earliest and, as it were, spontaneous exponent of this consciousness of preëminence."

Clement's letter was revered by antiquity only less than the Scriptures themselves. It was bound up with the Scriptures. It was publicly read in the churches with the Scriptures. Eusebius⁴ calls it "a great and wonderful letter," and informs us that it was "universally received by all" and that "both in former times, even the earliest, down to our own day (A. D. 325) it was, for the common benefit, publicly read in most of the churches." Irenæus (c. 170) called it "a most powerful epistle."⁵

Now, we may well ask, why this interference of Rome in the affairs of Corinth? At the beginning of Christianity, Dr. Gore would have us believe, all churches were on the same footing of equality. If Rome interferes later in the affairs of others she is "aggressive, domineering, arbitrary and intolerant;" but her interference in the first centuries presents itself to the Anglican Bishop of Birmingham in no such light. Why not? Because his case requires that he should, at all costs, prove that the Roman Bishop had usurped in the later centuries an authority which he did not possess in the earlier. The intrusion, however, of Clement into the internal affairs of the Corinthian Church calls for a clear explanation. By what right did he assume the tone of a superior and despatch a formal letter a long journey across seas to interfere, unsolicited,⁶ in the private affairs of an alien Church? And why did that proud and turbulent Church tolerate Clement's assumption of authority? Nay, why did that Church from the day on which Clement's letter was received⁷ bind up that letter with the canonical Scriptures and read it, Sunday by Sunday, as being of only less authority than the Bible itself? The Corinthians were a proud people; if, then, it was necessary to correct them, why was not the reproof administered by Christians of their own blood; by one of the neighboring and flourishing Churches, let us say, of Thessalonica, or Philippi, or Berea? Or, if the reproof was to come from beyond the soil of Greece, why not from that cradle of the Christian faith hard by, Asia Minor; from those elder sisters of theirs, the famous Churches of Smyrna and of Ephesus?

⁴ H. E. III., 16, 38; IV., 23; V., 6.

⁵ *ἱκανωτάτην γραφήν*. "Adv. Haer," III., c. 3, 3.

⁶ Freppel, "Les Pères Apostoliques," third ed., p. 136, here falls into the error of supposing that the Corinthians had, of their own accord, appealed for guidance to the Pope. That was not the case. Cf. Funk, "Patres Apostol., I., p. 60, note on *παρ' ἑμὶν* First Clement's, I., 1.

⁷ Lightfoot, "Apost. Fathers," Plate I., p. 369.

Nor is this, by any means, the whole case. There remains another and a much stronger reason still, for close at hand, at Ephesus, was St. John, the Beloved Disciple, Apostle and Evangelist, on whom were centred the love and respect of all Christendom. Why did not the needful reproof come from St. John, nigh at hand, rather than from that far-off Bishop of Rome, hiding in the Catacombs? The answer seems obvious. The Pope, as successor of S. Peter, was—and St. John was not—the Head of Christendom.

On this letter Dr. Gore has but lightly touched. This weighty evidence he has not set forth. He has not even suggested it. Nor does he attempt seriously to refute it. He writes as if the letter were no difficulty at all for his cause, and tells us that the claim to Papal supremacy is only "dimly discerned towards the end of the second century"—just one hundred years after Clement's time!

This famous letter is, however, so early and so strikingly a proof of Papal supremacy that it used to be the fashion for Protestants to assail its authenticity. Mosheim, Neander, the Tubingen School and especially Baur, Ammon, Schwegler and others, did their best in this direction, but with the to them unexpected and unwished for result that now no respectable scholar agrees with them, and the controversy is practically closed.

Again, present-day opponents, including Lightfoot, contend that, though the letter is authentic, it is the missive not of Clement at all, but of the Roman Church. On this point Dr. Gore writes with a fairness that does him honor that though in the letter "the tone of authority may be due to the prestige of the Church at Rome, it seems more likely that, while the letter is written in the name of that Church, the authority is mainly St. Clement's" (p. 94).⁸ And the Bishop is obviously right, for he has the whole of antiquity on his side.⁹ It is only a question of epistolary style, and the absence of Clement's name at the head of the letter no more implies that it was not his than our modern "Dear Sir" implies that the correspondent is really "dear." It would be absurd to expect in the first century the style of the Roman Chancellery of the twentieth. These collective titles were the early fashion. For instance, St. Paul writes the First Epistle to the Corinthians in the name of himself and "Sosthenes our brother;" the Second, of himself and "our

⁸ I note, too, that Dr. Gore gives up the well-worn Protestant argument that St. Peter was never in Rome (p. 93). Nor has he ever so much as a reference to that other hoary argument, which has served so many generations of controversialists, that "Petros" means not "rock," but "a stone," p. 76. This is progress!

⁹ Cf. Funk (*"Opera Patrum Apostolicorum,"* Tübingae, 1881, Vol. I., p. 17), who discusses the question at length and sums up his conclusion thus: "*Clementem eam exarasse vix dubium est, quum veteres ad unum omnes de hac re consentiant.*"

brother Timothy;" the Epistle to the Galatians, of himself and "all the brethren who are with me." But St. Paul was not, thereby, sharing his apostolic authority, especially with lay folk. A letter written collectively by many does not exclude the hierarchical distinction.

Again, Dr. Gore thinks that the commanding position of the Roman Church on this and other occasions was due "to the early munificence of her almsgiving" (p. 94). A curious plea indeed! But has not His Lordship mistaken effect for cause? The Roman Pontiff was not supreme because he gave alms, but he gave alms because he was supreme. He had the care of "all the churches." He was always Pope, that is "father," and the faithful everywhere were always his "children." His almsgiving was for the support of children by their father. This is distinctly affirmed by Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth: "For this practice has prevailed with you *from the beginning*, to do good to all the brethren in every way, and to send contributions to many churches, in every city . . . which custom was not only observed by your Bishop Soter (Pope, A. D. 168), but also increased, as he not only furnished great supplies to the saints, but also encouraged the brethren that came from abroad, *as a loving father his children.*"¹⁰ A custom that still survives!

I am not here proving Papal supremacy from patristic evidence. That task would need a volume. But I am pointing out that the Anglican Bishop of Birmingham in "beginning, towards the end of the second century, dimly to discern the first beginnings of the Popes' claim to be successors of S. Peter," has strangely failed to discern that same fact, not "dimly," but clearly, towards the end of the first. I may, however, be allowed to remind Dr. Gore that by denying the earlier evidence for Papal Headship he is committing himself to an indefensible position. For he is thereby asking Anglicans to believe that there can be an effect without a cause, a tree without roots, lofty edifice without foundations. When the era of persecution ceased the Pope came forth supreme. The supremacy of the Pope when he emerged from the Catacombs was as obvious as the sun is obvious when it emerges from behind clouds that have long obscured its face. From the Catacombs the Pope came forth to define dogma, to regulate discipline, to preside at Councils, to despatch legates from West to East. He claimed to be everywhere supreme; he exercised that claim, and as no one protested, no one wondered. How, then, could there be this "towering edifice of Papal pretensions"—as Mr. Cruttwell calls it—unless the foundations had been long, slowly and carefully laid? How could there be this great tree with ample branches, strong and erect, con-

¹⁰ Eusebius, H. E. IV., 23.

fronting all the gales of opposition, unless its roots had been, for long, shooting deep and wide into the earth? The era of persecution over, the Popes could claim and exercise supremacy, in the most striking fashion, and yet Gaul, Africa, Asia Minor, Greece and all other parts of the Christian world quietly recognized a power which—Anglicans would have us believe—had been born but yesterday and had a basis neither of right nor title. The Churches of Jerusalem, Antioch and Alexandria—as old as the Church of Rome itself—why did they admit this Headship? In other respects they were determined sticklers for their rights; then why did they not kick against the goad here? How came the yoke to be fastened so easily on their necks? The Anglican explanation makes their submission unintelligible. Indeed the more controversialists restrict the Pope's exercise of authority in the three first centuries, the more inexplicable do they render his world-wide exercise of that power in the centuries that follow.

In the darkness of the first ages we have but occasional glimpses of the laying of the foundations and the growth of the sapling, but in the fourth century the towering edifice and the mighty tree were undeniably there, and therefore we know for certain that the foundations of the one had long before been solidly laid, and that the roots of the other had early shot deep into the ground.

Dr. Gore (p. 13) writes of us Catholics thus: "We have ceased almost to hope to find in a modern Roman writer a candid review of the whole facts of a case where the Roman claims are in question. Candor, an attempt to fairly produce the whole case, a love of the whole truth—this seems to have vanished from their literature and its place is taken by an abundant skill in making the best of all that looks Romewards in church history, and ignoring the rest. . . . The Roman Church is disqualified from dealing broadly and frankly with facts."

Severe censure indeed; yet in face of our critic's own treatment of the "Prima Clementis" we may perhaps bear the blame with equanimity!

II.

We have already pointed out that the fundamental question at issue between Catholics and Anglicans is this, whether Pope or King be Spiritual Head of the Church. But that the English Sovereign is Supreme Head of the English State Church it is the purpose of this paper to recall to mind.

When the English Parliament established the territorial Church theory of "*Sic vexillum, sic religio*," and abolished—in England, Calais and the French Marches—the Spiritual Headship of the Pope

and thereby passed into schism, it substituted in its stead the Spiritual Headship of the Sovereign, and thereby passed into heresy. It is of prime importance to bear in mind that supremacy was not taken from the Pope and without breach of Catholic unity given to the English Church so that she thereby became autocephalous, but was taken from the Pope and transferred whole and entire to the Crown. The Pope had been for a thousand years, the Crown became, the Supreme Head in spirituals of the English Church. Nor was this done under protest from the Church. On the contrary, this transference of supreme spiritual functions from Pope to King, the Church of England herself ratified and accepted; she herself, with her own hands, fitted the yoke on to her own neck, and proclaimed herself to be "established by law." These facts are writ large on the face of the Statute Law of this realm, as a casual reader may see for himself by a glance at that admirable booklet, "The Reformation Settlement."¹¹

Take a few instances of this transference. The Act 24 Hen. 8, c. 12 recites that this Realm of England is an Empire governed by one Supreme Head and King, to whom a body politic, of spirituality and temporality, owes, next to God, obedience. And enacts that all causes relating to spiritual jurisdiction shall be determined within the King's jurisdiction.

Consequently the King, *i. e.*, Parliament, or in practice, the Privy Council, is for the State Church the Ecclesiastical Court of Final Appeal. Thus 25 Hen. 8, c. 19, sec. 4 provides that appeals shall lie from the Archbishop's Court to the King's Court of Chancery; and then, upon such an appeal, a commission shall be directed, under the great seal, to hear and determine such appeals; *and such judgment shall be final and without appeal.*

The Act 25 Hen. 8, c. 21 repeats that this Realm recognizes no superior under God but the King; and the King and Parliament have power to dispense from and make new laws *in all matters.*

The position is stated with admirable clearness in 26 Hen. 8, c. 1: The King, our Sovereign Lord, his heirs and successors, shall be taken, accepted and reputed the only Supreme Head on earth of the Church of England called *Anglicana Ecclesia*, and shall have and enjoy, annexed and united to the Imperial Crown of this realm, as well the title and style thereof, as all honours, dignities, preëminences, jurisdictions, privileges and profits to the said dignity of Supreme Head of the said Church belonging. And that our said Sovereign Lord, his heirs and successors, Kings of this Realm, shall

¹¹ "An Epitome of the Statute and Canon Law Thereon," by F. McMullan and Guy Ellis, Sands & Co., 1-6. This work no teacher of English history should be without.

have full power and authority to visit, reform and amend all such errors, heresies and abuses which by any spiritual authority or jurisdiction may be reformed, repressed or amended.

Then with logical frankness the King proceeds to act on the powers thus granted him and appoints a layman as Supreme Vicegerent. The Act 31 Hen. 8, c. 10 recites that as the King's Majesty is Supreme Head in earth, under God, of the Church of England, he hath made Thomas Lord Cromwel his Vicegerent, in all cases and causes touching the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and for the godly reformation and redress of all errors, heresies and abuses in the said Church. And enacts that the said Vicegerent, and all persons hereafter taking the said office, shall sit in all Parliaments on the same form as the Archbishop of Canterbury sitteth, and ABOVE the said Archbishop and his successors.

Act 31 Hen. 8, c. 14 advances another step and recites that the King is, *by God's law*, Supreme Head of the Church of England.

That the Papal jurisdiction was transferred to the Crown, and not to the State Church, is repeated in 37 Hen. 8, c. 17, which recites that the usurped power of the Bishop of Rome is directly repugnant to the King's Majesty as Supreme Head of the Church; that *the clergy have no ecclesiastical jurisdiction but by and under the King, who is the only Supreme Head of the Church of England, to whom all authority and power is wholly given to hear and determine all causes ecclesiastical.*"¹²

This is the Act which placed Diocesan Chancellors above their Bishops.

The Act 1 and 2 Philip and Mary, c. 8 abolished the title of Supreme Head.

The Act 1 Eliz., c. 1 repealed all the legislation of the previous reign for the restoration of the Catholic religion and reënacted the Protestant legislation of Henry and Edward. The Act does not expressly restore the title of "Supreme Head of the Church," but changes it into "Supreme Governor in Spiritual and Ecclesiastical things." It is, however, a distinction without a difference, for the Act annexes to the Crown all spiritual and ecclesiastical jurisdiction (secs. 16 and 17) and (sec. 18) empowers the Queen and her successors to appoint commissioners to exercise their spiritual and ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

Bishop Gibson's Codex summarizes this Act thus: "*Supreme Head of the Church of England, Papal and Regal. Such spiritual*

¹² Dr. Gore (p. 62) says: "The Bible is the ultimate record of the faith." Yes, but the Bible interpreted by whom? The Bishop answers: "The Church is the interpreter." Yes, but who is this Church? The English law answers: "The King."

jurisdiction as hath heretofore been exercised shall be forever annexed to the Crown!"

Thus were schism and heresy forced on the English people; first by bribing the upper classes with Church lands which amounted to a third of the land of England; secondly, by repeated Acts which made it high treason to refuse to forswear the Papal authority.¹³ To teach anything contrary to the King's instructions was punished by burning.¹⁴

This position the English Church fully accepted. By Act 1 Eliz., c. 1, s. 19 all Archbishops, Bishops and others swore as follows:

"I, A. B., testify and declare, in my conscience, that the Queen's Highness is the only Supreme Governor of this realm, as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things as temporal; and that no foreign prince, prelate or potentate hath, or ought to have, any jurisdiction, superiority or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm," etc.

Up to 1865 this oath, and a later modification of it, made impossible the belief in the Pope as "Patriarch of the West;" or as having a "Primacy of Honor;" or any other such like modifications of the ancient belief of Christendom.¹⁵

In the "Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical of 1603" the State Church decreed that "*the King's supremacy over the Church of England in causes ecclesiastical is to be maintained*" (Can. I.); and (Can. II.) she officially styled herself "*the Church of England, by law established, under the King's Majesty.*"

By law, then, the English Sovereign, King or Queen, or, in other words, the English Parliament, and in large measure the Prime Minister—not necessarily of any religion—is the Supreme Head of the Anglican Church. The Privy Council is the *Cathedra Petri* of Anglicanism. And this not in name merely, but in effect. For instance, in February, 1850, in the case of *Gorham vs. the Bishop of Exeter*, the Supreme Head decided against the Bishop that a beneficed clergyman of the Church of England might deny the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. That decision the English Church cannot and has made no attempt to repudiate. And the result is that one Anglican minister, with nearly all the instincts of a Catholic priest, may be compelled to discharge his functions side by side with another Anglican minister who is not even a Christian. An unbaptized person is, in the State Church, competent to hold the highest preferments—even the Archbishopric of Canterbury; so that if any agnostic Prime Minister chose to nominate such a one by a Letter

¹³ V. g. 28 Hen. 8, c. 10; 1. Edw. 6, c. 12; 1. Eliz., c. 1.

¹⁴ 34 and 35 Hen. 8, c. 1.

¹⁵ McMullan and Ellis, p. 43.

Missive "the dean and chapter shall with all convenient celerity elect and choose the same and none other; and in default of such election the King shall nominate and present the Archbishop by Letters Patent" (25 Hen. 8, c. 20, s. 4).

Lately, when an influential deputation waited on the Archbishop of Canterbury and proposed to make the first six centuries a rule of faith, the Primate, knowing the law, declared his inability to do more than sympathize with them, and referred them to the Royal Commission; that is, to the Supreme Head, or the Supreme Governor, if the latter term be preferred.

Dr. Gore has, in his "Roman Catholic Claims," a chapter on "Anglican Orthodoxy," in which he eloquently defends the partial orthodoxy not of the State Church, but of that particular party in the State Church of which His Lordship is so conspicuous an ornament. But are we wrong in supposing that an Anglican may believe as much or as little as he thinks fit, and as his own particular judgment recommends? We have Anglicans who admit all Catholic doctrine, even the supremacy of the Holy See. We have, or had lately, an Anglican minister who publicly taught—or used language such that he was understood publicly to teach—that God is not even a person, but a blind force. At the time of the publication of "Essays and Reviews" a document was drawn up by convocation in which there appeared a list of doctrines denied—so the document asserted—by the writers of that famous work. To this appeal the Supreme Judge, or "Supreme Governor in spiritual and ecclesiastical things," to wit, the Privy Council, decided that the book in question, setting forth these denials, contained nothing contrary to the articles and formularies of the Church of England, and thus did not deserve censure.¹⁶ Dr. Gore in his little book is careful himself to deny a certain number of Catholic doctrines, and thereby is exercising, like the writers of "Essays and Reviews," his own private judgment. It is true that in him the exercise of that faculty does not carry him by any means so far as it carried them; nevertheless, both parties act on precisely the same principle. The list of doctrines which those writers denied, and the denial of which the Supreme Governor declared not to deserve censure, is as follows:

1. The verity of miracles, including the idea of creation presented to us by the Bible.
2. Predictive prophecy, especially predictions concerning the incarnation, person and offices of our Lord.
3. The descent of all men from Adam.
4. The fall of man and original sin.
5. The divine command to sacrifice Isaac.

¹⁶ Cf. "The Crown in Council on 'Essays and Reviews,'" by Manning.

6. The incarnation of our Lord.
7. Salvation through the blood of Christ.
8. The personality of the Holy Spirit.
9. Special and supernatural inspiration.

To this catalogue if we add—what is of every day occurrence in the State Church, and even among the ministers—the denial of baptism, the real presence and eternal punishment, we have evidence on which to base a sound opinion as to what Anglican orthodoxy may be.

Nor is this a merely passing phase. The evil is rooted in the very nature of the State Church. As Papal supremacy is a principle of union, so royal supremacy, alias private judgment, is a principle of disunion. The one force is centripetal, the other centrifugal.

Then in what sense is the State Church "Catholic?" For the Catholic Church is the "pillar and ground of the truth."

If ever we are to have reunion, the path trodden at the Reformation will have to be retraced. Then ecclesiastical supremacy was, by legal forms, transferred from Pope to King. Reunion will require the re-transferrence of the same from King to Pope.

Dr. Gore pleads with all his eloquence against the supremacy of the Roman Sovereign. But in his argumentation there is nothing that is new. If the English Church is ever again to become Catholic, it must again become Roman. The Anglican Bishop of Birmingham's anti-Catholic booklet was, by anticipation, answered three centuries ago by two men as devout, as earnest, as learned and as acute as himself, and who sealed their belief with their blood.

Blessed John Fisher, Cardinal Bishop of Rochester, said to his venal judges: "My Lords, I am here condemned before you of high treason for denial of the King's supremacy over the Church of England, but by what order of justice I leave to God, who is the searcher both of the King, His Majesty's conscience and yours; nevertheless, being found guilty, as it is termed, I am and must be contented with all that God shall send, to whose will I wholly refer and submit myself. And now, to tell you more plainly my mind, touching this matter of the King's supremacy, I think indeed, and have always thought, and do now loudly affirm, that His Grace cannot justly claim any such supremacy over the Church of God as he now taketh upon him."

That was the faith of Catholic England and of Christendom. Hence, in his dying speech, Blessed Fisher said: "Christian people, I am come hither to die for the faith of Christ's holy Catholic Church."

And blessed Thomas More, Lord Chancellor of England, said: "I have, by the grace of God, been always a Catholic, never out of

communion with the Roman Pontiff; but I had heard it said at times that the authority of the Roman Pontiff was certainly lawful and to be respected, but still an authority derived from human law, and not standing on a divine prescription. Then when I observed that public affairs were so ordered that the sources of the power of the Roman Pontiff would necessarily be examined, I gave myself up to a most diligent examination of that question for the space of seven years, and found that the authority of the Roman Pontiff which you rashly—I will not use stronger language—have set aside is not only lawful, to be respected and necessary, but also grounded on the divine law and prescription. That is my opinion. That is the belief in which, by the grace of God, I shall die.”

For St. Peter's primacy, carried on by his successors, we have Scriptural authority, Patristic authority, Conciliar authority. But for the royal primacy what authority is there—Scriptural, Patristic or Conciliar?

He assuredly assumes a grave responsibility who uses pen and position to keep people from the Catholic Church and the sacraments by “rashly—I will not use stronger language—setting aside the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff, which is lawful, to be respected, necessary, grounded on prescription and divine law.”

It is for the Church to teach the individual, not the individual the Church.

CHARLES COUPE, S. J.

London, England.

THE EVOLUTION OF OUR ENGLISH BIBLE.

THE only authorized, in the sense of official Bible of the Catholic Church, is the Vulgate.¹ The historic Church is conservative of its ancient language, and it was inevitable that the authoritative form of the Scriptures for the Universal Church should be a Latin version. Whatever local authorization vernacular Bibles enjoy depends primarily on their being faithful renderings of the Vulgate—except in some inconsiderable Oriental sections of the Church. And so we cannot understand what our English version of to-day is unless we first acquaint ourselves, however cursorily, with the history and character of the Vulgate.

In studying the history of any translation of Sacred Scripture,

¹ The name is very ancient. The Vulgate's predecessor was called the *editio vulgata*, i. e., the vulgar or popular version; and St. Jerome's translation, in taking its place, inherited its name.

the question of the purity of its underlying text is of capital importance. A version, of course, will not attain its desired end unless it renders the original with at least substantial fidelity; but it is obviously paramount that this original should not be vitiated by textual corruptions, and no amount of linguistic or literary skill will overcome the radical fault of building upon a false or precarious foundation. The first essential of a good translation of Holy Writ is that its original text should, as far as possible, agree with the primitive inspired one. Hence the prominence this essay will give to everything bearing on the integrity and preservation of the basis, immediate and ultimate, of our sacred versions; matters which would be dry and tedious were it not that they concern so closely the value of those forms of the written Word which the Church and ecclesiastical authorities have placed in our hands.

THE MAKING OF THE VULGATE.

This venerable version is inseparably linked with a great and striking personality—a figure unique in Christian antiquity. The story of the making of the Vulgate is the story of Saint Jerome.

Eusebius Hieronymus—to give him once his full Latin name—was born of well-to-do Christian parents at Stridon, a town of semi-barbarous Dalmatia (now in Austria), and in the year of grace 342. He was sent to acquire a polite education at Rome; and the youth of eighteen was not proof against the allurements of the still half-pagan capital. Fortunately for himself and the world, to an ardent temperament Jerome joined an eager and able mind, and his passion for books and learning was a potent auxiliary to his better instincts in the struggle for the mastery. A youth who spent hours in toilsome copying to add another treasure to his parchment library could never become a vulgar profligate. The highest things appealed to him through the higher, and on a visit to Gaul he resolved to renounce the pleasures of the world. Hitherto only a catechumen, for fear of failing to keep the lofty standard required of the baptized Christian, Jerome at the age of twenty-four had himself christened by Pope Liberius at Rome. Yet his moral struggles were by no means over. Long after, the memory of his Roman pleasures haunted him as temptations; and all through his life he warred against an irascible and caustic temper, and overbearing impatience of opposition.

Space forbids us to follow the details of Jerome's career. He imbibed sacred knowledge and first fell under the influence of monastic discipline at Aquileia, in his native province. But his imperious and somewhat acrid temperament lost him friends, and

weary of embitterment and strife, the student turned his eyes toward the East, hoping to forget his heartburnings in the sweet calm of the holy places.

He went in company with a few friends, encumbering the long overland journey with his inseparable books. Jerusalem was the original goal, but illness and other circumstances detained him in Syria.² As he desired an anchorite's life in the desert, his stay at Antioch was short. He buried himself for five years in the sandy waste of the Syrian desert. But the fiery blood of youth and memories of his libertine days harassed him with dreadful temptations, and it was only by the most anguished efforts that he overcame himself. He chastened his body by rigorous penances, and to these, beside imploring prayers, he added a novel discipline—the study of Hebrew.³ It was a converted Jew, a monk, who initiated Jerome in the mysteries of the language of the Old Testament—a language for which he never entirely overcame his initial repugnance. At the end of his solitude the saint was induced to take priest's orders at Antioch, on condition that he was to be unencumbered by a charge. We find him spending a while at Constantinople as a disciple of its Bishop, Saint Gregory of Nazianzen, in Sacred Scripture, then the dominant theological study, and already Jerome's passion.

Thence he returned to Rome at the call of Pope Damasus, who had been impressed by Jerome's learning and orthodoxy, through a correspondence, and wished the benefit of his counsel at an approaching synod.⁴ Damasus soon recognized Jerome's vigor and ability. The Pontiff had not been long in personal intercourse with the latter when he chose him as his secretary and entrusted to him a flattering but difficult task. This was no less than a revision of the current Latin version of the New Testament and Psalter.⁵

The Old Latin Bible, of which these were parts, is not without interest to us, since it was the first translation into a Western tongue, and formed the basis of St. Jerome's revision, which still exists in the New Testament and Psalms of the Vulgate. Its origin is lost in obscurity. Scholars are generally agreed that there were a number of independent versions of the Greek Bible in the very first centuries of the Church. But whatever may have been the beginnings and diversities of the Old Latin, it is certain that a particular recension of it had been in use in Italy many years before Jerome's time, and had acquired a quasi-official authority as a text.

² Letter 30, to Eustochium.

³ Letter 125, to Rusticus.

⁴ Letter 52, to Nepotianus; Commentary on Ephesians v., 32.

⁵ Preface to the Gospels; dedicated to Damasus.

The Italian Old Latin was a superior type of that manifold version, having been revised at least once upon the Greek.⁶ But amateur correctors had since wrought such confusion that its theoretic unity was dispersed into actual multiplicity, and St. Jerome could complain of it: "Among the Latins there are as many different Bibles as copies."⁷

It was to bring order out of this confusion and create a standard text that Jerome addressed himself at the request of Damasus. The Gospels naturally came first. As the basis of his revision he carefully chose from a multitude of varying copies a few of the least adulterated and approaching most nearly to the text in the original language.⁸ All was executed with careful comparison with the Greek, and here again Jerome exercised discrimination in selecting among the Greek manuscripts.⁹ We have reason to think that the Greek text to which he gave the preference was better and older than those underlying the version he had in hand. In fact, the New Testament of St. Jerome has endless points of agreement with the oldest and most esteemed Greek manuscripts extant, and readings which are an improvement on the Old Latin must have been introduced by Jerome, if not also by the previous revisers.¹⁰

What is to be thought of the critical merits of the New Testament text as it issued from the saintly doctor's revision? The field of New Testament textual criticism is a peculiarly tangled and thorny one. Our extant Greek manuscripts—the very oldest of which are not older than the century of Jerome's revision—vary from each other in many little points, in some of greater consequence, and in a few of considerable length. The Greek text translated by the King James Version differs in thousands of details from that which the Revised Protestant stands for, while the Vulgate, in great part, combines elements of both; in lesser, it agrees with neither. Where lies the purest text? Neither the sacred autographs nor authentic copies of them have survived. Criticism is yet far from such a finality of results as to point with a sure finger to that type of the New Testament approaching most nearly the inspired autographs.

⁶ Cf. Hort's and Westcott's "The New Testament in the Original Greek;" Introduction, pp. 78-79.

⁷ Preface to Joshua.

⁸ Preface to the Revision of the Gospels: "You (Damasus) oblige me to make a new work out of the old, so that I sit like a judge among the copies of Scripture scattered over the world, and since they vary from one another, determine which of them agree with the Greek truth."

⁹ "We have been in such manner cautious in the emendation (of the Gospels) by a comparison of Greek codices—that is, old ones not differing much from the Latin reading—that we have corrected only those things that seemed to change the sense, leaving the rest stand." Preface to the Gospels.

¹⁰ See the appendix to Wordsworth's and White's edition of the Vulgate New Testament, pp. 660 ff.

But what criticism fails to give, we Catholics get in sufficient measure from authority. When the Council of Trent defined that the Scriptures, as they were from time immemorial read in the Vulgate, are sacred and canonical, *cum omnibus suis partibus*, it set the seal of the Church infallible on the genuineness of two greatly disputed passages: the woman taken in adultery, St. John vii., 53; viii., 11, and the ending of St. Mark's Gospel, xvi., 9-20. The same unerring pronouncement affords us the precious certainty that *no* portion of the Vulgate of considerable length or vital importance can rightly lie under suspicion.

Jerome put a restraint upon his work, keeping it strictly within the limits of an emendation.¹¹ He studiously avoided all unnecessary changes in the diction, mindful how the faithful folk jealously conserved traditional forms in matters religious. Hence the Latinity of the Vulgate is that of the older version, the language not of Cicero and Horace, but of the *plebs* of the early centuries. This vulgar language was, however, enriched by many new words, taken mostly from the Septuagint, conveying spiritual and abstract ideas, and it was ennobled and consecrated by its adoption into the Bible of the Church. The Old Latin had sprung from the demand of the common people unversed in Greek, and was primarily intended for their use.

The work was completed in about a year. Damasus, it seems, had died meantime, and Jerome, deprived of his friend, was anxious to be quit of his task and wind up his affairs in Rome. Therefore while the Gospels are carefully revised, the work on the rest of the New Testament is of a somewhat inferior quality, but on the whole the result was a successful and adequate rendition of the originals. A correction of the Psalter followed the New Testament, but Jerome was dissatisfied with this as hasty, and ten years later, in Palestine, brought out another revision of the Psalms.¹² This got the name *Psalterium Gallicanum* in distinction to the older edition, the *Psalterium Romanum*, and it is still the official Psalter of the Church. Jerome's later version direct from the Hebrew never found its way into the sacred offices, presumably from the difficulty of substituting a new translation for the familiar words of the old in the liturgical chant, in which the people then took part. Favored by the influence—perhaps the authority—of Damasus and its own merits, our saint's correction of the New Testament was not long in finding general acceptance, not indeed without much conservative outcry. But the practical Western genius which excluded the Psalter translated from the Hebrew, on account of liturgical diffi-

¹¹ See note 9 above.

¹² Preface to the Psalms.

culties, in this case was not without its disadvantages, for despite the saintly doctor's double revision, the Psalter of the Vulgate and Roman breviary has the defects inseparable from the translation of a translation.

Pope Damasus probably did not live to see the New Testament revision completed, and Jerome, deprived of his powerful friend and patron and involved in acrimonious disputes with enemies which his austere and fiery zeal had made in Rome, again turned his thoughts towards the East. He had gathered about him a group of devoted disciples, mostly high-born ladies, whom he had imbued with his own ardor in the study of the inspired Word. Of these Paula, a wealthy widow, and her daughters, Eustochium and Blesilla, are closely linked with his subsequent career. They resolved to follow their spiritual father and master to the Holy Land, for thither was Jerome bent, and there he wished to remain until life's close.

After at length reaching Bethlehem, which was his chosen home, he established himself in a hut or cave and returned to the coarse garb, the rude fare and the ascetic life of an anchorite. The first years at Bethlehem (circa 385-394) make the golden time of Jerome's life—years of idyllic Christian peace in that hallowed and serene atmosphere. In this congenial environment the saintly recluse again took up his Biblical studies with redoubled fervor. He perfected himself in Hebrew and the knowledge of the Hebrew text by means of a friendly Israelite who for fear of his brethren's displeasure came to the anchorite's cell only at night, "like another Nicodemus," to use Jerome's phrase.¹³ With what heroic effort he also mastered Aramaic, the language of parts of Daniel and Esdras, he has left us a graphic description.¹⁴ We cannot but admire the indomitable energy with which he overcame the then formidable obstacles to the knowledge of the original texts, for it was long before the age of Oriental grammars and lexicons, and Hebrew manuscripts at that time exhibited a blind array of strange-looking consonants without a sign to represent the needful vowels, which were transmitted only by word of mouth.

Jerome had begun and carried to a conclusion the revision of the Old Testament already referred to.¹⁵ But he excepted from this correction the books of Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch and the Machabees, probably also Tobias and Judith.¹⁶ This task brought more clearly to his view the defects of the Old Latin version of the

¹³ Letter 84, 65.

¹⁴ Preface to Daniel.

¹⁵ Against Rufinus, Book II., 24.

¹⁶ See Jerome's prefaces to the Books of Solomon and Jeremias.

Septuagint,¹⁷ and the discrepancies between the Greek itself and the Hebrew text. He saw that only a version direct from the Hebrew could do desirable justice to the inspired originals, and he resolved to begin such a translation. The saint had imbibed from his Jewish teachers an overweening esteem for the current Hebrew edition, the *Hebraica veritas*, as he loved to call it. He seems to have been convinced that it was the primitive text, in its purity. Yet on the whole his preference for it over the Septuagint was right. Only by extricating the original Hebrew of the Greek Bible could Jerome have possibly secured a fundamental text superior to his Hebrew copy—an extremely difficult achievement, and one which modern criticism, with all its advantages, is not yet ready to compass.

But St. Jerome's main motive in undertaking a new translation from the Hebrew rose higher than reasons of literary and philological criticism. He had been grieved at the helplessness of Christian apologists in opposing the Jews when the former would cite a passage according to the Septuagint, only to be scornfully told that it was wanting in the Hebrew original, and that the Christians were appealing to a Bible they did not know. He writes in the preface to *Isaias*, addressed to Eustochium: "I have toiled in a strange language to this end—that the Jews should no longer insult His (Christ's) Church for the falsity of the Scriptures." Throughout Jerome's allusions to the translation we can plainly discern the gracious figures of the matron and maiden, Paula and Eustochium, in the background, cheering him in his heavy task, following its progress with eager enthusiasm, lending whatever aid they can in the details of the undertaking. This element of the eternal feminine in Jerome's gigantic task, so far removed from the ordinary interests and pleasures of the sex, invests the making of the Vulgate with an unexpected grace.

To turn to a factor of quite a different order, the Septuagint is by no means a negligible quantity in the genesis of the Vulgate, for Jerome enjoyed the rare advantage of access to Origen's monumental "Hexapla" edition of that version, comprising in parallel columns the Alexandrian master's critical recension of the Septuagint and Aquila's, Symmachus' and Thedotion's independent Greek translations of the Old Testament—a combination affording invaluable aid for reference in the work.

Since the Hebrew copy which St. Jerome used was older by almost six centuries than our most ancient existing manuscripts in that language—the very oldest is dated 916 A. D.—it would

¹⁷ The Septuagint is the Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible, made by Alexandrian Jews in the third century before Christ.

appear at first sight that Jerome's text had an immense advantage in point of purity over the Hebrew which has come down to us and which is known as the Masoretic text. But an acquaintance with the history of the Jewish Bible rebuts this presumption. Strange to say, the hundreds of Hebrew manuscripts in existence show an almost stereotyped uniformity. They represent a single type most carefully reproduced by the copyists. We find among them only accidental and trifling differences, far removed from the marked variations between our Hebrew text and that which the Septuagint translators had before them. And when we seek to know when the Hebrew Bible took on this uniformity we can with reasonable certainty determine the time as about the middle of the second century of our era. The Vulgate and the quotations of the Talmudists prove that far back in the centuries the Jews had a single recension of the Old Testament which was fixed as well as the most scrupulous and religiously exact hand copying could fix it, and practically identical with the current text. So by taking the beginning of the Talmudic writings as the *terminus ad quem* we arrive at the conclusion that about 150 A. D. the Jewish doctors adopted a standard text and destroyed all other types so effectually that we possess but a single papyrus fragment as a manuscript witness of their existence. But the text underlying the Septuagint testifies indisputably that there were varying types of the Hebrew before the above period.

St. Jerome's Hebrew copy therefore was almost identical with that which is found in the printed Hebrew Bibles of to-day, and which formed the basis of the Protestant Authorized or King James Old Testament. The few variations deducible can be explained by the fact that Jerome had to depend on oral tradition to supply the vowels, and herein he had an advantage over the moderns, for this tradition was about four centuries older than that which the Masoretic scribes fixed by vowel points.¹⁸

But what assurance have we that our sole surviving Hebrew text is approximately true to that which came from the hands of the inspired writers? The Israelitic copyists were not always so scrupulous in keeping unity of text unimpaired and in transcribing the sacred rolls. That marked variations or rather types existed among ancient copies of the Hebrew Scriptures is a fact of which we are warned by the contents of the Septuagint, the Greek Bible translated from the Hebrew in the third century before Christ. In places its underlying text is obviously superior to our Hebrew, notably in the books of Samuel and Kings. But the differences at

¹⁸ Here and there, it seems, Jerome substituted Septuagint readings for his current Hebrew.

most affect only details of no great consequence, and we can rest confident that the Masoretic text, which is virtually that of St. Jerome, preserves the sacred originals in a high degree of integrity.

St. Jerome began his great enterprise of a Latin version direct from the Hebrew, about the year 390, by translating the books of Samuel and Kings. The entire work extended over fifteen years, being interrupted by other literary activity, correspondence, illness, controversies and other afflictions. Circumstances hastened the doing of several books. Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and the Canticle of Canticles were despatched in three days in order not to disappoint expectant friends.¹⁹ An Aramaic Tobias detained him only the single day he had the help of a friendly rabbi skilled in that language.²⁰ Literary accuracy necessarily suffered from this haste, but Jerome set no great store by punctilious exactness of expression. He cared little for nicety of wording except when needed to bring out the sense. This was his controlling aim according to a principle he laid down in a letter to a friend, "*non verba consideranda in scripturis, sed sensus.*" With the substantial sense of all the books of the Jewish Bible long years of reading had made him familiar, and his book-a-day rendering of the three Solomonic writings are marvelous for the circumstances.

Tobias and Judith more palpably show looseness. But there are ulterior reasons for this. Alone among the early fathers of the Church St. Jerome had a slight esteem for the seven books not found in the Hebrew Scriptures and not received by Protestants, but venerated by the Church as equally sacred and inspired with the rest. These are Tobias, Judith, Baruch, Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus, First and Second Machabees. To them are to be added the parts of Esther and Daniel whose originals exist only in Greek, that is of the former, chapter x., 4 to the end of the book, and for Daniel, the canticle of the three youths in the fiery furnace inserted between iii., 23 and 24 of the Hebrew, the stories of Bel and the Dragon and Susannah and the Elders. These books and additions, called "deutero-canonical" by Catholics, and the "Apocrypha" by non-Catholics, constitute the great difference between Catholic and Protestant Bibles.

No definite canon of Scripture had yet been formally imposed on the Universal Church, though the immemorial reading of the deutero-canonical books in the churches was a practical canonization, persisting amid the questionings which arose in the fourth century. So it was that Jerome, overinfluenced by Palestinian tradition, doubted the inspired character of these portions of the

¹⁹ Preface to the Books of Solomon.

²⁰ Preface to Tobias.

Old Testament. That he translated Tobias and Judith, from Aramaic originals, was due to his deference to the desire of certain Bishops. As for the rest of the seven, which were either composed in Greek (Wisdom, II. Machabees) or whose Hebrew originals were lost (Baruch, Ecclesiasticus, I. Machabees), we saw that Jerome had deemed them unworthy of revision. Hence our versions of these in the Vulgate come directly from the Old Latin untouched by the Doctor of Bethlehem. He translated the Greek additions to Daniel from Theodotion's version and borrowed the non-Hebrew parts of Esther from the Old Latin without revising.²¹

At Eustochium's request St. Jerome translated Josue, Judges and Ruth, while lamenting the loss of Paula, who died in 404. Tobias and Judith seem to have been the last, and the task was completed about 405. The great work was at length done, and well done. The only one of the age who was capable of it, the providential sage who embraced the learning of his world, who united a thorough knowledge of the classic tongues, a mastery of Hebrew, a familiarity with Oriental life—such a one had given to the Church a new Bible.

Of course, there are defects in it. The wonder is that there are not more. But after all faults are acknowledged and deductions made, the Vulgate remains one of the greatest monuments of Christian zeal giving energy to learning and power. The grandeur of the achievement grows as we contemplate this masterpiece which wrested the sacred ideas from a forbidding and unexplored language and for the first time clothed them in a Western one. Therefore the Old Testament of the Vulgate is more than a mere translation. It is almost a creation. And the anguish, the tears, the long and heavy toil of the penitent recluse of Bethlehem are in it. Instinctively we honor the heroic soul and masterful mind who performed the work. And it is a pleasure to find the latest Protestant student of the Vulgate, Mr. H. J. White, gladly reëchoing the grateful words of the Protestant translators of the Authorized Version, words which Catholics may well make their own: "This moved St. Hierome, a most learned Father, and the best linguist without controversy of his age, to undertake the translating of the Old Testament out of the very fountains themselves; which he performed with that evidence of great learning, judgment, industry and faithfulness that hath forever bound the Church unto him in a debt of special remembrance and thankfulness."²²

The new version met with scant favor at first. Even sane and moderate men like St. Augustine shook their heads and questioned

²¹ Commentary on Daniel xli., 18. Translation of Esther, Migne, Vol. XXVIII., xv., 5.

²² The translators to the reader.

its expediency. The body of the faithful, always extremely sensitive to changes in traditional forms, looked askant at Jerome's work as a mischievous innovation. An African Bishop excited a riot in his church when he read from the new translation, in Jonas iv., 6, the word *ivy* (*hedera*) instead of the familiar *gourd* (*cucurbita*).²³ Slowly, very slowly, the version won recognition by its intrinsic superiority, for no ecclesiastical decree or statute gave it an official standing. But Jerome did not see its triumph except perhaps by prevision. By the time of the Lateran Council, 647, the Vulgate had prevailed in the Roman and Italian churches, but it was not until the eighth century that it had supplanted the antique version everywhere and Venerable Bede could call the latter old.²⁴ However, the Old Latin was very tenacious of life, and even as late as the twelfth century enjoyed a certain practical value.

The appended synopsis shows at a glance the composition and the intermediate and ultimate sources of our Latin Bible (LXX=Septuagint):

OLD TESTAMENT.

All books except the following translated directly from the Hebrew:
 Psalms (revised twice), Old Latin, LXX.....Hebrew
 Baruch, Ecclesiasticus, I. Machabees (not revised), Old Latin, LXX, Hebrew
 Tobias, Judith, AramaicHebrew
 Wisdom, II. Machabees (not revised), Old Latin, LXX.....Greek
 Esther x., 4; xvi., 24 (not revised), Old Latin, LXX.....Greek
 Daniel iii., 24-90 (not revised), Old Latin, Theodotion's Greek.....Hebrew
 Daniel xii., xiv. (not revised), Old Latin, Theodotion's Greek.....Greek

NEW TESTAMENT.

All books are revisions of the Old Latin.....Greek
 N. B.—St. Matthew's Gospel was composed originally in Aramaic or Hebrew.

THE TRANSMISSION OF THE VULGATE.

The Vulgate underwent the fate of all literature which could not be preserved and multiplied except by hand copying. The deterioration of its text could be prevented only by such extraordinary precautions and rigid rules as enabled the Talmudic and Masoretic scribes to hand down a uniform Hebrew type. But Christian copyists did not practice this letter-worship, and though they naturally gave greater care to the transcription of the Bible than that of mere human compositions, it was copied much oftener and hence the chances of error were so much increased as to offset the caution of copyists. Even to-day, with all our facilities for procuring pure texts, long lists of errata are features of early editions of large books. If Bibles are exceptions, it is because their texts have been reprinted and revised so often that all but absolute correctness is attained.

²³ Augustine to Jerome, Migne, Vol. XXII., col. 929, 930.

²⁴ Commentary on Genesis xi., 31.

Before the invention of printing it was morally impossible to have a universally accessible text, fixed in form and serving as a standard. With the best available copy before him and the best of will, the eye of the tired scribe would go amiss; the more familiar phrases of the older version or another text would unawares glide into the manuscript through his mind; a note or gloss placed in the margin would through the inadvertence or officiousness of later copyists creep into the body of the page. Accordingly the most serious errors in manuscript Latin Bibles are interpolations. But at first ignorance and officiousness led to adulterations in other forms. Cassiodorus, an abbot of the sixth century, is the first we know to have applied himself to remedy the already degenerate state of St. Jerome's version. The regulations he imposed on his monks to guide them in copying and amending reveal the fact that the alterations of his time had come chiefly from those who were offended at grammatical solecisms and strange expressions they found in the copy before them and judged that St. Jerome could not have written such bad Latin.²⁵

The history of the reproduction of the Bible of the Middle Ages—that is the Vulgate—has two quite different aspects. One is that of devotional art, in which we see the patient and loving labor of the expert copyist, usually a monk, producing with sure and skilful touch those wonderfully regular and beautiful pages of cursive script or black-letter, interspersed with exquisite illuminations, all compelling our admiration as we gaze at one of these mediæval manuscripts which are the most prized treasures of large libraries and wealthy collectors. The other side of the story is that of new errors with each new copy, a progressive corruption of the text, arrested at times by intermittent efforts at purification.

The limits of this essay will permit scarcely more than an enumeration of the principal of these. In the long periods of the history of the Vulgate extending from the early Middle Ages down to the Council of Trent in the sixteenth century, there are three well-marked epochs: 1. Alcuin's revision. 2. The Correctoria and Paris Bible of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. 3. The printed editions of Stephanus.

1. Alcuin, Charlemagne's chancellor, abbot of St. Martins at Tours and the great scholar of his time, was charged by his imperial master with the task of Bible reform.²⁶ His efforts, seconded by Charlemagne's powerful influence, effected some good, but failed to bring about practical uniformity even in his own day. The

²⁵ "De Integritate Divinarum Litterarum," Migne, Pat. Lat. Vol. LXX., 1, 105 ff.

²⁶ See the capitularies or decrees providing for the correction of the whole Bible; Berger, "Histoire de la Vulgate," pp. 185-186.

Bibles of this era, though magnificent in adornment, betray many variations from each other.²⁷ 2. The most intelligent and scholarly endeavor to restore the Vulgate's text in its purity was that of the correctors of the thirteenth century, witnessed now in the emended and annotated manuscript Bibles called *correctoria*. They strove to amend the Paris Bible, the edition in general use, and unfortunately an interpolated and depraved text.²⁸ Yet we must guard against an exaggerated view of the condition of the Bible of the Middle Ages. For substantial fidelity to Jerome's text abided under the shifting form of details, and that Bible can be justly described as corrupt only relatively to its original textual perfection. This is proved by an inspection of the manuscripts or an examination of the Biblical quotations of the scholastic theologians. 3. The printed editions of the fifteenth century were uncritical, perpetuating many of the faults of the Paris Bible. Robert Estienne, latinized into Stephanus, a scholar-printer of Paris, brought out an edition in 1528 which aimed at a critical restoration. This was improved upon in subsequent issues. The Stephanus Bible is the ultimate printed basis of the official edition of the Vulgate.²⁹

The critical taste of the Renaissance found much fault with the inelegant Latinity of the ancient version, and a number of would-be classical editions, some revisions, others translations anew of the Hebrew and Greek, appeared to add to the already sufficient confusion. The Council of Trent took cognizance of the situation, but first it solemnly reaffirmed the traditional canon of the Scriptures, declaring that the books of the Old and New Testaments, "as they are accustomed to be read in the Catholic Church and are found in the ancient Latin Vulgate edition," be received as sacred and canonical with all their parts. Of course, this canonization did not extend to the language and wording of St. Jerome's version, but only to the ideas they convey. No one pretends that Jerome was an inspired translator. The sacredness of a version is necessarily mediate and conditioned on the completeness and exactness with which it reproduces the thoughts of the inspired originals.

The preference shown by the fathers of Trent for the Vulgate could have little more than a theoretic value until that would be redeemed from the corruption and doubts entangling it. The

²⁷ Cf. Berger, "Histoire de la Vulgate," 225-226.

²⁸ Roger Bacon calls it "horribiliter corruptus." *Opus Majus*, ed. Jebb, p. 49. Cf. H. Denifle O. P. in "Archiv für Literatur des Mittelalters," Freiburg, 1888, IV., 281.

²⁹ In view of this fact, the character of Estienne's material is important, but we are able to identify only four out of the fourteen manuscripts he used. Of these the best go back to the ninth century, and have much critical value. See the catalogue of manuscript in Berger, p. 408.

Council took two wise measures to put an end to the existing chaos of translations and texts. It chose the Vulgate as against all modern Latin versions to be the "authentic," that is, authoritative one, and so to be used exclusively in all public readings, disputations, sermons and expositions.⁸⁰ And it resolved to ask the Holy See to take in hand the reformation of the Vulgate and the establishment of a typical or standard edition.

That Trent applied the term "authentic" in its ancient legal sense of "authoritative," and not in that of absolute fidelity to the originals, is a fact evinced by the proceedings preparatory to the decree, as well as the text of the decree itself. The act was a practical, not a dogmatic one.

The Council's action regarding the Vulgate was hailed with pleasure by the Catholic world in general as putting an end to the bewilderment of various current versions. But the Humanists were disgruntled at this exclusive approval of what, in their eyes, was a barbarous relic of an unenlightened age. Curiously, these mutterings found echoes at Rome, where the Renaissance was at its height and Humanism strongly intrenched. Cardinals of the Curia and not a few Roman theologians shook their heads at the decree and feared that the Council had set its weighty stamp upon a version undeserving of it. Pope Paul III. himself hesitated for a while to give the act his sanction, doubting the wisdom of formally authorizing a version of Holy Writ all of whose faults could not be ascribed to copyists and printers. The episode is fully illustrated by the serious correspondence upon the subject between officials of the Roman court and one of the Cardinal Legates presiding at Trent,⁸¹ and it is curious to see the legate pleading for the approval of the decrees as they came from the synod. But they at length obtained the Papal confirmation and have full binding force to-day.

The Holy See, as requested by the Council, undertook the revision of the ecclesiastical Bible with a view to an official and standard text. The true path to uniformity was at length entered upon. A pontifical commission was appointed, sitting at Rome. Like most Roman committees it proceeded on its task slowly and deliberately. The preliminary work had begun promptly on the sanction of the Biblical decrees in 1546 by Paul III. In 1561—a new commission having been appointed meanwhile—the results had reached such a stage that Pope Pius IV. was about to arrange for publication, but

⁸⁰ De Editione et Usu Sacrorum Librorum, Sess. IV.

⁸¹ Printed in Father Vercellone's essay, *Sulla autenticità della . . . Bibbia volgata*, etc., pp. 12 ff. Also in the same author's *Dissertazione Accademiche*, Rome, 1864, pp. 79-87. The latter work also gives the text of the original documents for the subsequent history of the revision.

desisted when the commission urged that it was not yet satisfied that its labors were ripe for the press.

Rome's majestic slowness is not without its drawbacks, and the Catholic world would have unduly suffered for the want of a standard edition, actualizing the boon of Trent's decrees, if the default had not been partially supplied by individual and corporate enterprise. It is fair to say, however, that this was stimulated not only by the Tridentine statute regarding the printing of the authorized version, but also by the motion of the Apostolic See.³² The famous Antwerp printer Plantin published between 1546 and 1573 a series of critical editions of the Latin Bible, based on the best text of Stephanus and carefully prepared by John Henten and other learned members of the Louvain faculty of theology.

It was the idea of Cardinal Peretto, later Pope Sixtus V., that an emended edition of the Septuagint would be a valuable help in the correction of the Vulgate Old Testament. In consequence the commission's labors were diverted to this enterprise, and during nine years work on the Vulgate waited the completion of the scholarly Sixtine Septuagint. As for the Greek New Testament, the revisers had at their command the celebrated Codex Vaticanus or Vatican manuscript, dating from the fourth century and considered by most modern critics the purest and most precious of the ancient copies.

When the Septuagint was finally out of the way that energetic and autocratic Pontiff, Sixtus V., pushed the work with commendable zeal. All the resources of Papal authority were employed to bring to Rome the oldest and best Latin codices, or at least copies of their variations. The monks of Sant Amiato were reluctantly compelled to part with the treasure of their library, the noted Codex Amiatinus of the eighth century and the acknowledged prince of Vulgate manuscripts. An examination of the official text shows that in the ultimate form of the revision the Amiatine copy and kindred manuscripts filled a respectable but by no means predominant part. In most of the *important* variant readings the typical Vulgate is not in company with them.³³

The commission which wrested with the accumulation of material left by its predecessor and collected by Sixtus V. was a truly representative body, counting among its members the learned Italian

³² See the dedication to Gregory XIII. of Plantin's Bible, partially reprinted in Kaulen, "Geschichte der Vulgata," p. 433, note.

³³ In this regard I have collated four chapters, representing the four Gospels. Out of seventy-seven readings where the Amiatine excels, the standard Vulgate follows it in forty-seven. Twelve of the seventy-seven are important, affecting the sense. The official text agrees with the Amiatine in only two of these.

Jesuits Agelli and Bellarmin, the French critical scholar Morin, the Spanish Valverde and the English Cardinal Allen, who had been the moving spirit of the Rheims-Douay English version. This was undoubtedly the ablest of the series of revising boards which labored at the task, and on the whole its influence was the greatest.

The principles by which it was guided, and which with two exceptions were followed to the finish, are set forth in a document prefixed by Sixtus to the edition of 1590. The correctors were to restore as nearly as morally possible the text as it came from the hands of St. Jerome. They were to treat with respect readings consecrated by long ecclesiastical usage and refrain from making changes of a startling nature. The first authority was to be allowed to manuscripts, and this according to their age. Second were to come quotations of the Fathers. Recourse was to be had to the Hebrew and Greek only when the foregoing criteria left the reading obscure or ambiguous. The results were noted in the margin of the best edition of Henten's Bible, which served therefore as the immediate basis. Henten's preface informs us that he consulted thirty-one manuscripts and two editions, but it is impossible to identify any of the former, and the critical merits of this heir to Stephanus cannot be historically determined. Finally the revisers were instructed that the text as printed would be definitive; no alternative readings were placed in the margin.

The commission at length turned over the result of its toil to Sixtus V. But that Pope, who as Cardinal had belonged to the revising body, revised the revision, retouching with a free hand and on his individual judgment. So numerous were the changes he made that when the long expected official edition appeared in July, 1590, the learned commission could not recognize the child of its arduous travail. Their vexation was naturally great. The Pontiff died soon after, happy to have brought his cherished project to completion. But before his successor was chosen the president of the committee whose results had been so rudely treated caused the sale of the Sixtine edition to be stopped.

The delicate problem of an honorable burial of the discredited Sixtine Bible was solved under Gregory XIV. in the following manner: It was determined that the official Vulgate should be reprinted under the name of Sixtus V., after being purged of his ill-advised changes. A new commission was named, embracing some of the ablest members of the former body. The Sixtine rules were kept with two wise modifications. In choosing between variant readings of manuscripts the Hebrew and Greek texts were given precedence over the Fathers. Again a traditional reading stood only when supported by some testimony of critical worth;

but one entirely wanting critical authority was not to be spared, no matter how long current. Some doubtful readings were left to the decision of the Pope. But Gregory XIV. died on the eve of the intended publication of the revision, and the official Bible suffered another setback.

Clement VIII. was raised to the throne in 1592. The Vulgate was fated to undergo another, and this time a superfluous revision. The new Pope entrusted the charge to two Cardinals and the learned Jesuit Toletus, the latter of whom did practically all the work. It was completed in seven months, and the new Bible appeared in 1592 with the name of Sixtus in the title page. It was Sixtine in the sense that, broadly speaking, the methods followed were those prescribed by Sixtus V., and the bulk of the conclusions of the Sixtine commission retained. But this edition, henceforth and at present the typical one, is better known as the Clementine.

Between the beginning and close of the undertaking of which the Clementine Vulgate is the final fruit forty-six years had elapsed and twelve Popes reigned. Revision had come upon revision, and human learning and scholarship provided with large means had spent itself in the work. Yet it is not perfect, and the official preface disclaims that the edition is a faultless restoration of St. Jerome's translation. But no one may dispute the words of the same preface concerning this Clementine Bible of 1592, "that it is not to be doubted that it is purer and more correct than any other text which has appeared down to this time." Modern criticism may pick flaws in the standard Vulgate, but nevertheless in the text officially fixed after a scrutiny of unexampled thoroughness, the Catholic Church has given to itself and the world an approximately pure recension of the most historic and time-honored of the Christian versions.

THE RHEIMS AND DOUAY VERSION (OR OUR ENGLISH CATHOLIC BIBLE).

The merciless anti-Catholic laws of Elizabeth's reign not only proscribed the priesthood, but made it impossible for young Catholic Englishmen to prepare themselves even remotely for the ranks of the clergy by a college education, as the universities and schools were closed to all of the old faith who were not ready to sacrifice their religious principles. In consequence the Catholic student was driven to the Continent.

To meet these conditions and supply devoted missionaries to keep alive Catholic faith in the mother country, at the peril of their lives, various seminaries and schools were established on the Continent.

None is so long and closely linked with the struggles of Catholicism in England as the missionary college, or as it would now be styled, seminary of Douay, the seat of a university, then in the Netherlands, and now in Northern France. It was established in 1568 through the efforts of a remarkable man, Dr. William Allen, later a Cardinal. Through some causes which are obscure, but probably political in their nature, the faculty and students removed to Rheims, France, in 1578. It was there that the New Testament was translated and published—the first printed English edition issued under Catholic auspices.⁸⁴

We are fortunate in being able to trace the inception of the Rheims-Douay Bible in a Latin letter written by President Allen under the date of 1578 and preserved in the English College at Rome.⁸⁵ After describing the methods taken to familiarize the students with Holy Scripture, the writer refers to the difficulty of Catholic preachers in handling a Bible translated in a tongue unknown to the auditors. "When they are preaching to the unlearned and are obliged on the spur of the moment to translate into the vulgar tongue some passage which they have quoted, they often do it inaccurately and with unpleasant hesitation, either because there is no vernacular version of the words or it does not then and there occur to them. Our adversaries, on the other hand, have at their fingers' ends, from some heretical version, all those passages of Scripture which seem to make for them, and by a certain deceptive adaptation and alteration of the words produce the effect of appearing to say nothing but what comes from the Bible. This evil might be remedied if we, too, had some Catholic version of the Bible, for all the English versions are most corrupt. I do not know what you have in Belgium. But certainly we on our part will undertake, if His Holiness shall think proper, to produce a faithful, pure and genuine version of the Bible, in accordance with the edition approved by the Church, for we already have men most fitted for this work."

Within a month the much needed version was begun, and the following entry in the college diary for 1578 tells us the plan followed in translating the New Testament, and doubtless later the Old: "On October 16th or thereabouts Martin (Licentiate in theology) began a translation of the Bible into English, with the object of healthfully counteracting the corruptions whereby the heresies have so long lamentably deluded almost the whole of our country-

⁸⁴ Regarding Catholic manuscript Bibles in English, the reader is referred to Abbot Gasquet's "Old English Bible and Other Essays;" also to an article by the present writer in the *Catholic World* of March, 1904.

⁸⁵ Letters and memorials of Cardinal Allen in "Records of English Catholics," 1882, Vol. II., pp. 52 ff.

men. In order that the work—most useful as it is hoped—may be published the more speedily, he completes daily the translation of two chapters, which, to secure greater correctness, are read through by Allen, our President, and Bristow, our Master, who in their wisdom faithfully correct whatever seems to need emendation.”³⁶

The great burden of the heroic enterprise of translating the whole Bible was thus borne by a single man, Gregory Martin. How was he fitted for such a task? He had been a scholar of St. John's College, Oxford, and later tutor in the family of the Duke of Norfolk. He had a name among his fellows for the highest skill in Hebrew and the classics. When the Duke visited Oxford a deputation from the university addressed him and paid a high compliment to their former associate, Martin: “You have, illustrious Duke, our Hebraist, our poet, our ornament and glory.”³⁷ Wood, the chronicler of noted Oxonians, says of him: “He was a most excellent linguist, exactly read and versed in the Sacred Scriptures, and went beyond all of his time in human literature, whether in poetry or prose.”³⁸ In addition to this proficiency in Latin, Greek and Hebrew, Martin joined the valuable advantage of familiarity with the current English versions of the Bible as appears from a treatise from his pen entitled “A Discoverie of the Manifold Corruptions of the Heretikes of Our Daies, Especially the English Sectaries, & Rheims, 1582.”

The translation followed the Vulgate with almost servile exactness. Says the preface to the New Testament of 1582: “We are very precise and religious following our copie, the old vulgar approved Latin, not only in sense, which we hope we alwaies doe, but sometimes in the very words and phrases.” The words of the title, “Diligently compared with the Greeke,” are not an idle boast. The Greek Testament lay before Martin, and it left its impress on the Rheims, first in the numerous Greek readings on the margin of the original editions, and more prominently as a guide in the choice of the article, wanting in Latin. The other editions in “divers languages” are not named, but it is extremely probable that the diction was influenced by the traditional phraseology which is the common stock of the English Protestant Bibles, beginning with Tyndale's. Another borrowed element may be discerned in the form of the Rheims-Douay Version. Martin and his colleagues had an English translation of the Vulgate New Testament ready to hand in Coverdale's, and as Dr. J. C. Carleton has remarked, the Rhemish trans-

³⁶ Douay College Diaries, Vol. I. of “Records of English Catholics,” p. 162.

³⁷ *Athenae Oxonienses*, col. 487, Vol. I., edition of 1813.

³⁸ *Ibid.*

lation has a considerable number of readings in common with Coverdale's work.³⁹

But what is at once the characteristic literary trait and the disfigurement of the Rheims-Douay is its many Latinisms, such as *inhabiters of the land*, Gen. i., 11; *in latitude* for "in a spacious place," Osee iv., 16; *impudicities* for "immodesties," Mark vii., 21; *celestials* for "heavenly places," Eph. ii., 6; *concorporat and comparticipant*, Eph. iii., 6; *exinanited himself* for "emptied himself," Philip ii., 7. This strong admixture of curious Latin-English in the Anglo-Saxon stream of its language was due to an exaggerated reverence for the Vulgate, leading the translators to keep its verbal forms as far as possible, and sometimes even to coin strange words from the Latin.

The translators claim entire sincerity for their work, while not without reason accusing the contemporary Protestant versions with corrupting the sense. "We boldly avouch," they wrote, "the sinceritie of this translation, and that nothing is here either untrue or obscurely done of purpose in favor of the Catholike Roman religion." This assertion has not been disproved. Dr. Scrivener, an eminent Protestant critic, testifies: "In justice it must be observed that no case of wilful perversion has ever been brought home to the Rhemish translators."⁴⁰ It is true the phraseology of the Rheims has a sacerdotal and sacramental turn. "Presbyter" (Greek, *presbuteros*) is rendered by "priest;" "justitia" (*dikaiosis*), by "justice;" "poenitentiam agere" (*metanoiein*), by "do penance;" "sacramentum" (*mysterion*), by "sacrament." All of these renditions—which have been kept in the current revision of the Rheims—may be criticized from a linguistic point of view, and it is quite possible that they were partially the result of theological preoccupations, but in every case except "priest" (it had been for centuries the traditional sense of "presbyter" in the Church) they are amply explained by the translators' policy of adhering to the Vulgate's forms.

The New Testament was printed at Rheims in 1582. Martin lived to see this event, but the tremendous strain he had borne for several years proved fatal to his health, and in September of the same year he died and was buried at Rheims. The Rheims and Douay Bible bears the consecration of this supreme sacrifice of a noble life spent in the service of the Church.

The Old Testament had been done into English immediately after the New, but the faculty's poverty, their "poor estate in ban-

³⁹ "The Part of Rheims in the Making of the English Bible," p. 30.

⁴⁰ Supplement to the Authorized Version, 1845; quoted in Cotton's "Rhemes and Doway," p. 156.

ishment," as they quaintly phrase it, forced them to defer the publication of this part. It appeared at length at Douay (whither the college had returned) in 1609 and 1610. As the official or Clementine edition of the Vulgate was now available, the Old Testament was conformed to this, and the marginal Greek readings omitted.⁴¹ Both Testaments are accompanied by explanatory notes, in accordance with the spirit of the Church, which has been hostile to placing the Bible in the hands of the laity without precautions against the waywardness of private interpretation.

These notes are voluminous in the New Testament of 1582, and of the polemical character of that age of fierce theological controversy. It was chiefly on their account that its publication evoked a mass of acrid criticism and several bulky "confutations" from English Protestants. But the translators of the King James, while not sparing a fling at the Rheims in their preface, had quietly made the despised Popish version do yeoman service in the preparation of their Bible. There are no fewer than 2,383 places where the Authorized agrees with the Rheims against all then existing English versions of note, and a Protestant scholar has recently demonstrated that the King James' "debt to Roman Catholic Rheims is hardly inferior to her debt to Protestant Geneva."⁴²

CHALLONER'S BIBLE.

The Rheims-Douay version filled an urgent need and performed good service. But with the lapse of time its spelling and some of its words became obsolete, and its Latinisms grew more uncouth to readers who contrasted it with the pure and idiomatic English of the Protestant Bible. There was an increasing demand for a more suitable and intelligible form of the Sacred Word for English-speaking Catholics. In 1718 Dr. Nary, an Irish priest, published a new translation of the New Testament, and in 1730 appeared another by Dr. Witham, of Douay College. But neither of these enterprises succeeded in taking the place of the old Rheims. It was a century since this had been reprinted. In 1738 a handsome folio edition of the Rheims was issued with modernized spelling and a few verbal improvements. But this after all was a makeshift and failed to satisfy the want of an idiomatic Bible. Another entered the field of Biblical revision who was destined to succeed and whose work endures. This was Richard Challoner.

One of the most singular ironies of literary history is the oblivion that has befallen the capital part of Dr. Challoner in the production

⁴¹ Preface to the Douay Old Testament, 1609.

⁴² "The Part of Rheims in the Making of the English Bible," by Dr. Jas. G. Carleton, D. D., 1902, p. 31.

of our English Catholic Bible. The scholar and zealous prelate who gave us that Bible is not awarded even the scant recognition of placing his name on the title pages of reprints of his version—except perhaps in connection with certain brief notes. To read the title pages and introductory notices of our current editions one would suppose that the evolution of our vernacular Bible had been arrested where it began, in the sixteenth century, and that our publishers are furnishing us very accurate reproductions of the antique and curious translation of Gregory Martin.

Richard Challoner was born of Protestant parents in 1691 in Sussex, England. Early left fatherless, he was placed by his poor mother under the protection of a Catholic family belonging to the gentry of the neighborhood. His talent attracted notice and he was sent to Douay College, where he showed marked ability in the classics, especially in Greek. Here, at the age of twenty-one, he became a Catholic, and after completing his studies was ordained a priest and sent to his native land, where the field of his labors was London and Southern England. His learning, talents and virtues were recognized by Vicar Apostolic Petre, and he was made coadjutor of the London vicariate in 1741, succeeding to the administration in 1758, at the age of sixty-seven. He died, aged ninety, in 1781, after having passed through the sore trial of Gordon's No-Popery riots, the shock and anxiety of which occasioned his death.⁴³ His life was full of zeal and literary activity, for he left some forty controversial, historical and religious works, but none of these can be compared in value and importance with his revision of the Rheims and Douay Bible. It was as Coadjutor Bishop that he accomplished this. There is good reason to suppose that he had been concerned in the Rheims New Testament of 1738, and then realized the inadequacy of anything short of a thorough revision of the old version.⁴⁴ Challoner's New Testament appeared in 1749 at London, and the next year he published the whole Bible.

He has left us no account of the principles and methods he followed. We are therefore thrown back on the evidence of the version itself. From this it appears that the ruling idea was to render the ancient Rheims-Douay more intelligible and acceptable to modern readers. The literalisms were replaced by idiomatic forms, the construction was modernized and obsolescent terms made way for familiar ones. In short, Challoner's Bible is infinitely better adapted to modern readers than the old version. The great majority of its constant variations from the Rheims-Douay are in the direction of improvement.

⁴³ "Life of Dr. Richard Challoner," by Rev. T. Barnard, 1793, *passim*.

⁴⁴ "Barnard's Life," p. 128. Compare Cotton's "Rhemes and Doway," 47.

It is true Dr. Challoner's revision sacrificed here and there pithy and felicitous Anglo-Saxon words and phrases which in the ancient Bible stood side by side with cumbrous Latinisms. But the reviser, while erring sometimes in taste, had sufficient literary tact to retain many of these, and what we lost through him in this manner we regain by the Anglo-Saxonisms he borrowed from the Authorized. So we have scattered through our current Bible a goodly number of expressions which lend a quaint, archaic flavor to the vernacular form of the sacred text. Most of these are original with the older version. Instances are *heart* instead of *bowels*, Gen. xliii., 30; *good-man of the house*, Matt. xii., 37; *comely*, Eccli. xxv., 6; *carefulness* for *solicitude*, II. Cor. vii., 11; *Why make you this ado?* Mk. v., 39; *word sower*, Acts xvii., 18. We owe a few to Challoner himself, as *falleth out*, Ex. xvii., 16; *He will bring those evil men to an evil end*, Matt. xxi., 41. On the other hand, there are palpable literary blemishes in Challoner's Version, most of which are legacies from the Rheims-Douay. There is often a halting, unrhythmical quality in the style. This is frequently due to a survival of Latin words, as *inhabit*, *conduct*, when Anglo-Saxon equivalents would have been better employed. *Was* or *were* *come* is a weak substitute for *came* or *had come*; the flaccid *would* is too often found where the original demands *willed* or *desired*, e. g., Col. i., 27. The force of the Latin *autem* and the Greek *de* is often ignored or weakened, where the King James renders by *yea* or *now* very happily. A minor fault is the capricious alternation of *hath* and *has*.

Turning from the literary merits of Challoner's Bible to consider it simply as a translation, we naturally ask: Is it a good faithful version? The answer must be that it has the essential virtue of fidelity in a high degree. The sense of the Vulgate is often imperfectly reproduced, for no translation can be an exact equation of its original. But comparatively few actual mistranslations may be charged against our English Bible, and these are almost invariably of minor consequence. Five chapters taken at random from different parts of the version should be fairly representative. Careful examination of Exodus xviii. reveals no erroneous translation. In Psalms xxxiii. there is none; in Ecclesiasticus xxv. there is one.⁴⁵ The New Testament is slightly inferior. Chapter xxviii. of St. Luke, in the common text, contains three minor mistakes;⁴⁶ II. Corinthians vii., a short chapter, two.⁴⁷ With a slight qualification we have in Challoner's revision an accurate translation of the official

⁴⁵ "Not to be imagined by the mind" fails to convey the meaning of "insuspicabilia cordis," which is "surprising things."

⁴⁶ *To this place* for *usque huc*, v. 5; *oried again* for *succclamabant*, 21 (corrected in the edition of 1752); *drew on* for *illucescebat*, 54.

⁴⁷ *For you* for *in vobis*; *boast boasting* for *gloriari*, *gloriatio*, v. 14.

Vulgate, and the many instances where it does not conform to the Hebrew and Greek originals are due to the very fact that it is a faithful reproduction of the Latin version both for the better and the worse. In other words, in a vast majority of cases the fault is with the Vulgate and not with Challoner.

It is for the same reason, namely, that Challoner is habitually so true to his originals, that his voluntary departures from them are so surprising and notable. For it is a fact that with the standard text he took intentional liberties, few and scattered, indeed, in comparison with the great mass, but nevertheless many in the aggregate. There are few chapters wherein some little conscious deviation from the Vulgate may not be found. The changes are modest, inasmuch as they extend only to words and phrases, but bold inasmuch as they are in contravention of typical text and ecclesiastical version. Sometimes they are in the form of an extreme freedom of interpretation in order to approach nearer to the sense of the Hebrew or Greek. But time and again, especially in the Old Testament, Challoner simply parts company with the Vulgate to give a rendering truer to the originals than the scrupulous Rheims and Douay had dared. In doing so the revision generally, though not invariably, adopts the Protestant reading. To illustrate, there are three deviations of this kind in Exodus xxiii;⁴⁸ two in Proverbs x.;⁴⁹ two in Osee iv.;⁵⁰ four in Luke xxiii.;⁵¹ one in II. Corinthians vii.⁵²

Yet Dr. Challoner was not thoroughly consistent, for we occasionally meet cases in which the older version is more faithful to the original than his revision.

It is abundantly clear that the revision was done with constant reference to the original texts, that is the Hebrew and Greek, and that these exercised a notable influence upon the work. Dr. Challoner also kept in view the typical or Clementine Vulgate, which had appeared after the Rheims New Testament had been published.

Still more tangible is the influence of the Protestant Authorized, more familiarly known as the King James Version. An overwhelming preponderance of Challoner's literary changes are in the direction of the Protestant Bible. Doubtless many of these are merely natural coincidences and would have been chosen regardless of the Authorized Version, but the not infrequent identities where other words might easily have been employed leave no question

⁴⁸ In verses 5, 6, 27.

⁴⁹ See 4, 9, 14, 23.

⁵⁰ In 4, 19.

⁵¹ Verses 2, 10, 22, 26.

⁵² Verse 7.

that the King James was constantly before the translator and exercised a very considerable influence in the diction of the new version.

I have called Challoner a translator and his edition a version. And indeed the changes he introduced are so marked and considerable that the identity of the old Bible disappears in them. What Cardinal Newman said of Challoner's labors upon the New Testament may with equal correctness be applied to the Old: "They issue in little short of a new translation."⁵³ The result of these labors mediates between a thorough revision and an independent translation. It merits the name "Challoner's Version" as properly as the Protestant Revised is conceived as a version distinct from the Authorized. If we have any right to call our current English text the "Douay Bible," as is the common usage among us, it is on the slender ground that its author aimed to keep the readings of the Rheims-Douay so far as was consistent with a thoroughly improved version of the Vulgate.

Nothing will so well illustrate the evolution which the Rheims-Douay Bible underwent as the appended parallels. The influence of the King James upon Challoner (and in rare cases on the Rheims of 1738) is indicated by italicizing the words which coincide with the Protestant against the older version, while Challoner's departures from the Vulgate to the sense of the Greek are shown by placing the words or phrases between asterisks:

PSALM CXVII., 1-17.

Douay.

1. Confesse ye to our Lord because he is good; because his mercie is for ever.
2. Let Israel now say that he is good: that his mercie is for ever.
3. Let the house of Aaron now say: that his mercie is for ever.
4. Let them now say which feare our Lord; that his mercie is for ever.
5. From tribulation I invocated our Lord: and our Lord heard me in largeness.
6. Our Lord is my helper: I will not feare what man can doe to me.
7. Our Lord is my helper: and I will look over mine enemies.
8. It is good to hope in our Lord, rather than to hope in man.
9. It is good to hope in our Lord, rather than to hope in princes.
10. All nations have compassed me: and in the name of our Lord am I revenged on them.
11. Compassing they have compassed me, and in the name of our Lord I was revenged on them.
12. They compassed me as bees,

Challoner, Denvir's Edition.

- Give* praise to *the* Lord for he is good: for his mercy *endureth* for ever.
- Let Israel now say, that he is good: that his mercy *endureth* for ever.
- Let the house of Aaron now say, that his mercy *endureth* for ever.
- Let them that fear *the* Lord now say, that his mercy *endureth* for ever.
- In* my trouble I *called upon the* Lord; and *the* Lord heard me and enlarged me.
- The* Lord is my helper: I will not fear what man can do unto me.
- The* Lord is my helper: and I will look over mine enemies.
- It is good to *confide* in *the* Lord rather to *have confidence* in man.
- It is good to *trust* in *the* Lord, rather than to *trust* in princes.
- All nations have compassed me *about*, and in the name of the Lord I have been revenged on them.
- Surrounding me they have compassed me *about*: and in the name of *the* Lord I have been revenged on them.
- They surrounded me *like* bees, and

⁵³ "Tracts, Theological and Ecclesiastical," 1895, p. 416.

and were inflamed as fyre in thornes; and in the name of our Lord I was revenged on them.

13. Being thrust I was overturned to fal: and our Lord received me.

14. Our Lord is my strength, and my prayse: and he is made my salvation.

15. The voice of exultation, and of salvation in the tabernacles of the just.

16. The right hand of our Lord hath wrought strength: the right hand of our Lord hath exalted me, the right hand of our Lord hath wrought strength.

17. I shal not die, but shal live: and I will tel the workes of our Lord.

they burned like fire among thorns; and in the name of the Lord I was revenged on them.

Being pushed I was overturned *that I might fall: *but* the Lord supported me.*

The Lord is my strength and my praise; and he is become my salvation.

*The voice of rejoicing and of salvation *is* in the tabernacles of the just.*

The right hand of the Lord hath wrought strength: the right hand of the Lord hath exalted me: the right hand of the Lord hath wrought strength.

I shall not die, but live and shall declare the works of the Lord.

The easy superiority of the Revision in rhythm, in purity of English, in the suppression of the unbiblical "our Lord" is seen at a glance.

EPHESIANS III., 1-14.

Rhelms of 1582.

Rhelms of 1738.

Challoner, Denvir's Ed.

1. For this cause, I Paul the prisoner of IESUS Christ, for you Gentiles:

2. If yet you have heard the dispensation of the grace of God, which is given me toward you,

3. Because according to revelation the Sacrament was made knowne to mee, as I have written before in brief.

4. According as you reading may understand my wisdom in the mystery of Christ.

5. Which unto other generations was not knowne to the sonnes of men, as now it is revealed to his holy Apostles and Prophets in the Spirit:

6. The Gentiles to be coheirs and concorporat and comparticpant of his promise in Christ IESUS by the Gospell:

7. Whereof I am made a Minister according to the gift of the grace of God, which is given mee according to the operation of his power:

8. To mee, the least of all the Saints, is given this grace among the Gentiles to evangelize the unsearchable riches of Christ.

9. And to illuminate

For this cause, I Paul the prisoner of JESUS Christ, for you Gentils: If yet you have heard the dispensation of the grace of God, which is given towards you.

Because, according to revelation, the sacrament was made known to me, as I have written before in brief:

According as you reading may understand my wisdom in the mystery of Christ,

Which unto other Generations was not known to the sons of men, as now it is revealed to his holy Apostles and Prophets in the Spirit.

That the Gentils are co-heirs and of the same body and partakers of his promise in Christ JESUS by the Gospel:

Whereof I am made a Minister according to the gift of the grace of God, which is given to me according to the operation of his power:

To me, the least of all the Saints, is given this grace, among the Gentils to *preach* the unsearchable riches of Christ.

And to illuminate all

For this cause, I Paul the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles;

If yet you have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God which is given me towards you.

How that, according to revelation, the *mystery* has been made known to me, as I have written above in a few words;

As you reading, may understand my *knowledge* in the mystery of Christ,

Which ~~in~~ other generations was not known to the sons of men, as ~~it~~ *is now* revealed to his holy apostles and prophets in the Spirit:

That the Gentiles *should be fellow-heirs*, and of the same body, and co-partners of his promise in Christ Jesus, by the gospel:

Of which I am made a minister, according to the gift of the grace of God, which is given to me according to the operation of his power:

To me, the least of all the saints, is given this grace, to *preach among the Gentiles* the unsearchable riches of Christ,

And to enlighten all

all men what is the dispensation of the Sacrament hidden from the worlds in God, who created all things:

men what is the dispensation of the sacrament hidden from worlds in God, who created all things:

men that they may see what is the dispensation of the *mystery which hath been* hidden from eternity in God, who created all things:

10. That the manifold wisdom of God may be notified to Princes and Postestats in the celestials by the Church,

That the manifold wisdom of God may be notified to the Princes and *Powers* in the celestials by the Church,

That the manifold wisdom of God may be made *known* to the *principallities* and *powers* in *heavenly places* through the church,

11. According to the prefnition of worlds, which he made in Christ IESUS our Lord.

According to the prefnition of worlds, which he made in Christ JESUS our Lord.

According to the *eternal *purpose,** which he made, in Christ Jesus our Lord:

12. In whom we have affiance and accesse in confidence, by the faith of him.

In whom we have affiance and access in confidence by the faith of him.

In whom we have *boldness* and access *with* confidence by the faith of him.

13. For which cause I desire that you faint not in my tribulations for you, which is your glory.

For which cause I desire that you faint not in my tribulations for you, which is your glory.

Wherefore I pray you not to faint at my tribulations for you, which is your glory.

14. For this cause I bowe my knees to the Father of our Lord IESUS Christ.

For this cause I bow my knees to the Father of our Lord JESUS Christ,

For this cause I bow my knees to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ,

The stylistic changes which the editors of the New Testament of 1738 made in verses 6, 8, 10 mark that issue as a real, though very modest transition between the original Rheims and Challoner's. The reading of verse 16 reveals that the 1738 edition was not conformed to the standard Vulgate.

Dr. Challoner published an edition of the New Testament in 1752, which differs not a little in phrasing and construction from that of 1749, and generally for the better. To illustrate: In Matt. xvi. "Who said," verse 6, becomes "And he said;" verse 8, "for that ye have," "because you have;" verse 20, "he commanded," "he charged;" "Go behind me, Satan," is improved to "Get thee behind me, Satan;" 25, "he that will save," "whosoever will save;" 26, "what exchange will a man give for his soul?" becomes "what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" All but the first of these readings of 1752 are conformed to the Authorized. These differences between Challoner's first and third edition of the New Testament total more than two thousand. We have almost absolute fixity in the Old Testament "Douay," for Challoner's version of 1750 has not been retouched. But our New Testaments have no such uniformity. The Troy New Testament, so called from Archbishop Troy, of Dublin, who gave it approbation, was a recension of Challoner's of 1752, with many original variations. Troy's strongly influenced the Haydock Bible, famous for its copious notes and first published in England in 1810-11. A text based on Haydock's was first printed in America in Dunigan's magnificent folio edition of 1852-56. I say *based* because the unknown American editor introduced not a few differing readings. Later large editions

of Bibles copy Haydock's faithfully, without always seeming to be aware of the fact. Indeed, what may be called the preceding generation of English Catholic Bibles, the large family editions, no longer in favor, were both in our own country and England strongly colored by the Troy New Testament, which, though based on Challoner's of 1752, has, as we have seen, a character of its own. These are the only modern Bibles which have been affected by the text of 1752; the tincture is very slight and our American editions have acquired it in the roundabout way of *via* Haydock, *via* Troy.

But of late years, since the ponderous family Bibles have been superseded by handy octavos and small quartos, there has been a return to Challoner pure and simple, without any Troy admixture. Most contemporary American editions are reprints of the text edited by Dr. Denvir, Bishop of Down and Connor, early in the last century. Denvir closely follows Challoner's New Testament of 1749, borrowing only a few words from the third edition, among them the questionable "that" for "who" and "which." Perhaps Bishop Denvir looked coldly upon Challoner's edition of 1752 because of its more pronounced leaning toward the Protestant Version. Anyhow, it has come about that the type of the New Testament prevailing in the United States and Ireland reproduces the less rhythmical and felicitous of Challoner's editions. In England Haydock's Challoner with its foreign element seems still to be ascendant, so that neither there is the edition of 1752 received. Further, for America and Ireland at least it is true that the multiplicity of texts of the New Testament, which recent Protestant essayists have exaggerated,⁵⁴ is rapidly disappearing, for our leading Bible publishers, by reprinting Challoner's text of 1749, are bringing about a desirable uniformity.

Dr. Challoner's Old Testament is undoubtedly the received text of all English-speaking Catholics. As seen above, the United States and Ireland practically have one accepted form of the New Testament also. The writer cannot speak with authority for England, Canada and the British possessions, but everywhere *some* recension of Challoner is in use. Challoner's Bible has never received the formal approbation of the Holy See.⁵⁵ But it has been authorized by ecclesiastical statutes or the formal sanction of Bishops. It is in the former manner that the version, taken generally without specification of a typical edition, enjoys the status of official approval in the United States.⁵⁶ Theoretically, the old

⁵⁴ "Catholic and Protestant Bibles Compared," 1905, containing the prize essays of the Gould competition.

⁵⁵ See "Concilia Baltimorensia," 1851, p. 66.

⁵⁶ "Conc. Balt.," pp. 26, 77; "Concillum Balt." Plen. II., Acta et Decreta, No. 16.

Rheims and Douay has the same privilege. In Ireland, Denvir's Bible received the recommendation of the hierarchy in the form of a declaration prefixed to a Dublin edition of 1857. So far as observed no formal approbation has been given to the "Douay" in England, Scotland and the British colonies beyond that of individual Bishops. But in all countries the authorization is merely positive and does not exclude the public and private use of other Catholic translations of the Vulgate.

We have had three English versions by Catholics since Challoner's: Dr. Lingard's Four Gospels, translated mainly from the Greek text, which was published in 1836 and has seen at least one more edition, viz., 1851; Archbishop Kenrick's⁵⁷ Bible, appearing by parts between 1849 and 1860, a translation from the Latin, and finally the Gospels translated by Father A. F. Spencer, O. P., from the Greek, with reference to the Vulgate and Syriac, and published in 1898. All these are works of real scholarship, but Dr. Kenrick's translation, being the only one faithful to the ecclesiastical version, is alone in any situation to compete with Challoner's Bible as a current text for public use. But it has not met with popular favor, and indeed the form of its only complete edition—a number of separate octavo volumes—was unsuited to a wide circulation. The Four Gospels alone reached a second edition.

Challoner's attempt succeeded owing to a combination of intrinsic merit, the author's prestige and the peculiar circumstances of the time. But the day is past when any translation or revision of the Scriptures by individual scholarship can hope to win public confidence and widespread acceptance. The conservative sense is strong in this field. Only the prestige and authority of a Catholic university or body of collective scholarship can take up the enterprise of a new version with the promise of both intrinsic success and popular esteem for the work. But even so, the result would be disappointing to the learned unless the translators would be permitted, in a measure exceeding Dr. Challoner's, to go behind the Latin text in order to correct certain crying errors. If such latitude would not be enjoyed, the improvement would be utterly disproportionate to the labor. If we must keep strictly to the Vulgate, that would be an unwarranted attempt that would seek to replace our time-honored and excellently received English version.

GEORGE JOSEPH REID.

St. Paul's Seminary, St. Paul, Minn.

⁵⁷ Of Baltimore.

PIUS PP. X.

MOTU PROPRIO.

DE PROTONOTARIIS APOSTOLICIS, PRAELATIS URBANIS,
ET ALIIS

QUI NONNULLIS PRIVILEGIIS PRAELATORUM PROPRIIS FRUUNTUR.

INTER multiplices curas, quibus ob officium Nostrum apostolicum premimur, illa etiam imponitur, ut venerabilium Fratrum Nostrorum, qui episcopali caractere praeferunt, pontificales praerogativas, uti par est, tueamur. Ipsi enim Apostolorum sunt Successores; de iis loquitur Cyprianus (ep. 69, n. 8) dicens, "Episcopum in Ecclesia esse et Ecclesiam in Episcopo;" nec ulla adunatur Ecclesia sine Episcopo suo, imo vero Spiritus ipse Sanctus "posuit Episcopos regere Ecclesiam Dei" (Act. xx., 38). Quapropter, "Presbyteris superiores esse Episcopos," iure definivit Tridentinum Concilium (Sess. xxiii., c. 7). Et licet Nos, non tantum honoris, sed etiam iurisdictionis principatum supra ceteros Episcopos, ex Christi dispositione, tamquam Petri Successores, geramus, nihilominus Fratres Nostri sunt Episcopi, et sacra Ordinatione pares. Nostrum ergo est, illorum excelsae dignitati sedulo prospicere, eamque pro viribus coram christiano populo extollere.

Ex quo praesertim Pontificalium usus per Decessores Nostros Romanos Pontifices aliquibus Praelatis, episcopali caractere non insignitis, concessus est, id saepe accidit, ut, vel malo hominum ingenio, vel prava aut lata nimis interpretatione, ecclesiastica disciplina haud leve detrimentum ceperit, et episcopalis dignitas non parum iniuriae.

Quum vero de huiusmodi abusibus ad hanc Apostolicam Sedem Episcoporum querelae delatae sunt, non abnuerunt Praedecessores Nostri iustis eorum postulationibus satisfacere, sive Apost. Litteris, sive S. Rit. Congr. Decretis pluries ad rem editis. In id maxime intenderunt Benedictus XIV., per epist. S. R. Congr. d. d. 31 Martii MDCCXLIV., "SSmus Dominus Noster," iterimque idem Benedictus, d. 17 Februarii MDCCCLII., "In throno iustitiae;" Pius VII., d. 13 Decembris MDCCCXVIII., "Cum innumeri," et rursus idem Pius, d. 4 Iulii MDCCCXXIII., "Decet Romanos Pontifices," et Pius IX., d. 29 Augusti MDCCCLXXII., "Apostolicae Sedis officium." E sacr. Rit. Congregatione memoranda in primis Decreta quae sequuntur: de Praelatis Episcopo inferioribus, datum die 27 mensis Septembris MDCLIX. et ab Alexandro VII. con-

firmatum; dein Decreta diei 22 Aprilis MDCLXXXIV. de Canonicis Panormitanis; diei 29 Ianuarii MDCCLII. de Canonicis Urbinatibus; diei 27 Aprilis MDCCCXVIII. de Protonotariis Titularibus, a Pio PP. VII. approbatum; ac diei 27 Augusti MDCCCXXII. de Canonicis Barensibus.

Hisce tamen vel neglectis, vel ambitioso conatu, facili aufugio, amplificatis, hac nostra aetate saepe videre est Praelatos, immoderato insignium et praerogativarum usu, praesertim circa Pontificalia, viliores reddere dignitatem et honorem eorum, qui sunt revera Pontifices.

Quamobrem, ne antiquiora posthabeantur sapienter a Praedecessoribus Nostris edita documenta, quin imo, ut iis novum robur et efficacia adiiciatur, atque insuper praesentis aevi indoli mos iuste geratur, sublatis omnibus consuetudinibus in contrarium, nec non amplioribus privilegiis, praerogativis, exemptionibus, indultis, concessionibus, a quibusvis personis, etiam speciali vel specialissima mentione dignis, nominatim, collective, quovis titulo et iure, acquisitis, assertis, aut praetensis, etiam Praedecessorum Nostrorum et Apostolicae Sedis Constitutionibus, Decretis, aut Rescriptis, confirmatis, ac de quibus, ad hoc, ut infirmantur, necesse sit peculiariter mentionem fieri, exquisito voto aliquot virorum in canonico iure et liturgica scientia peritorum, reque mature perpensa, motu proprio, certa scientia, ac de Apostolicae potestatis plenitudine, declaramus, constituimus, praecipimus, ut in posterum, Praelati Episcopis inferiores alique, de quibus infra, qua tales, non alia insignia, privilegia, praerogativas audeant sibi vindicare, nisi quae hoc in Nostro documento, Motu Proprio dato, continentur, eademque ratione ac forma, qua hic subiiciuntur.

A.—DE PROTONOTARIIS APOSTOLICIS.

I. Quatuor horum habeantur ordines: I. Protonotarii Apostolici de Numero Participantium, septem qui Collegium privative constituunt; II. Protonotarii Apostolici Supranumerarii; III. Protonotarii Apostolici ad instar Participantium; IV. Protonotarii Apostolici Titulares, seu honorarii (extra Urbem).

I.—PROTONOTARII APOSTOLICI DE NUMERO PARTICIPANTIUM.

2. Privilegia, iura, praerogativas et exemptiones quibus, ex Summorum Pontificum indulgentia iamdudum gaudet Collegium Protonotariorum Apostolicorum de numero Participantium, in propriis Statutis nuperrime ab ipsomet Collegio iure reformatis inserta, libenter confirmamus, prout determinata inveniuntur in Apostolicis Documentis inibi citatis, ac praesertim in Constitutione "Quamvis

peculiaris" Pii. Pp. IX., diei 9 mensis Februarii MDCCCLIII., paucis exceptis, quae, uti infra, moderanda statuimus:

3. Protonotarii Apostolici de numero Participantium habitu praelatio rite utuntur, et alio, quem vocant pianum atque insignibus prout infra numeris 16, 17, 18 describuntur.

4. Habitu quotidiano incedentes, caligas, collare et pileum ut ibidem n. 17 gestare poterunt, ac insuper Annulum gemmatum, quo semper iure utuntur, etiam in privatis Missis aliisque sacris functionibus.

5. Quod vero circa usum Pontificalium insignium, Xystus V. in sua Constitutione "Laudabilis Sedis Apostolicae sollicitudo," diei 6 mensis Februarii MDCLXXXVI., Protonotariis Participantibus concessit: "Mitra et quibuscumque aliis Pontificalibus insignibus, etiam in Cathedralibus Ecclesiis, de illorum tamen Praesulum, si praesentes sint, si vero absentes, absque illorum consensu, etiam illis irrequisitis, extra curiam uti," in obsequium praestantissimae Episcoporum dignitatis, temperandum censuimus, ut pro Pontificalibus, extra Urbem tantum agendis, iuxta S. R. C. declarationem quoad Episcopos extraneos vel Titulares, diei 4 mensis Decembris MCMIII., ab Ordinario loci veniam semper exquirere teneantur, ac insuper consensum Praelati Ecclesiae exemptae, si in ea sit celebrandum.

6. In Pontificalibus peragendis, semper eis inhibetur usus throni, pastoralis baculi et cappae; item septimi candelabri super altari, et plurium Diaconorum assistentia; Faldistorio tantum utentur, apud quod sacras vestes assumere valeant. Pro concessis enim in citata Xysti V. Constitutione, "quibuscumque aliis pontificalibus insignibus," non esse sane intelligenda declaramus ea, quae ipsis Episcopis extra Dioecesim sunt interdicta. Loco Dominus vobiscum numquam dicent Pax vobis; trinam benedictionem impertientur numquam, nec versus illi praemittent Sit nomen Domini et Adiutorium, sed in Missis tantum pontificalibus, Mitra cooperti, cantabunt formulam Benedicat vos, de more populo benedicientes; a qua benedictione abstinebunt, assistente Episcopo loci Ordinario, aut alio Praesule, qui ipso Episcopo sit maior, ad quem pertinet eam impertiri.

7. Ad Ecclesiam accedentes, Pontificalia celebraturi, ab eaque recedentes, habitu praelatio induti, supra Mantelletum Crucem gestare possunt pectoralem, a qua alias abstinebunt; et nisi privatim per aliam portam ingrediantur, ad fores Ecclesiae non excipientur ut Ordinarius loci, sed a Caeremoniario ac duobus clericis, non tamen Canonicis seu Dignitatibus; seipsos tantum aqua lustrali signabunt, tacto, aspersorio illis porrecto, et per Ecclesiam procedentes populo numquam benedicent.

8. Crux pectoralis, a Protonotariis Participantibus in pontificalibus functionibus adhibenda, aurea erit, cum unica gemma, pendens a funiculo serico rubini coloris commixto cum auro, et simili flocculo retro ornato.

9. Mitra in ipsorum Pontificalibus erit ex tela aurea (numquam tamen pretiosa) quae cum simplici alternari possit, iuxta Caerem. Episcop. (I., xvii., nn. 2 et 3); nec alia Mitra nisi simplici diebus poenitentialibus et in exsequiis eis uti licebit. Pileolo nigri coloris sub Mitra dumtaxat uti poterunt.

10. Romae et extra, si ad Missam lectam cum aliqua solemnitate celebrandam accedant, habitu praelatio induti, praeparationem et gratiarum actionem persolvere poterunt ante altare, in genuflexorio pulvinaribus tantum instructo, vestes sacras ab altari assumere, aliquem clericum in Sacris assistentem habere, ac duos inferiores ministros. Fas erit praeterea Canonem et Palmatoriam, Urceum et Pelvim cum Manutergio in lance adhibere. In aliis Missis lectis, a simplici Sacerdote ne differant, nisi in usu Palmatoriae. In Missis autem cum cantu, sed non pontificalibus, uti poterunt etiam Canone et Urceo cum Pelvi et lance ad Manutergium.

11. Testimonium autem exhibere cupientes propensae voluntatis Nostrae in perinsignem hunc coetum, qui inter cetera praelatorum Collegia primus dicitur et est in Romana Curia, Protonotariis Participantibus, qui a locorum Ordinariis sunt exempti, et ipsis Abbatibus praecedunt, facultatem facimus declarandi omnibus qui Missae ipsorum intererunt, ubivis celebrandae, sive in oratoriis privatis, sive in altari portatili, per eiusdem Missae auditionem diei festi praecepto rite planeque satisfieri.

12. Protonotarius Apostolicus de numero Participantium, qui ante decimum annum ab adepto Protonotariatu Collegium deseruerit, aut qui a decimo saltem discesserit, et per quinque alios, iuxta Xysti V. Constitutionem, iisdem privilegiis gavisus fuerit, inter Protonotarios ad instar eo ipso erit adscriptus.

II.—PROTONOTARII APOSTOLICI SUPRANUMERARII.

13. Ad hunc Protonotariorum ordinem nemo tamquam privatus aggregabitur, sed iis tantum aditus fiet, qui Canonicatu potiuntur in tribus Capitulis Urbis Patriarchalium, id est Lateranensis Ecclesiae, Vaticanae ac Liberianae; itemque iis qui Dignitate aut Canonicatu potiuntur in Capitulis aliarum quarundam extra Urbem ecclesiarum, quibus privilegia Protonotariorum de numero Apostolica Sedes concesserit, ubique fruenda. Qui enim aut in propria tantum ecclesia vel dioecesi titulo Protonotarii aucti sunt, aut nonnullis tantum Protonotariorum privilegiis fuerunt honestati neque Protonotariis

aliisve Praelatis Urbanis accensebuntur, neque secus habebuntur ac illi de quibus hoc in Nostro documento nn. 80 et 81 erit sermo.

14. Canonici omnes, etiam Honorarii, tum Patriarchalium Urbis, tum aliarum ecclesiarum de quibus supra, tamquam singuli, insignibus et iuribus Protonotariorum ne fruantur, nec gaudeant nomine et honore Praelatorum, nisi prius a Summo Pontifice inter Praelatos Domesticos per Breve adscripti sint, et alia servaverint quae infra num. 34 dicuntur. Protonotarius autem ad instar, qui Canonicis eiusmodi accenseatur, eo ipso privilegia Protonotarii Supranumerarii acquirat.

15. Protonotarii Apostolici Supranumerarii subiecti remanent proprio Ordinario, ad formam Concilii Tridentini (Sess. 24, c. 11), ac eorum beneficia extra Romanam Curiam vacantia Apostolicae Sedi minime reservantur.

16. Habitum praelatitium gestare valent coloris violacei, in sacris functionibus, idest caligas, collare, talarem vestem cum cauda, nunquam tamen explicanda, neque in ipsis Pontificalibus celebrandis: sericam zonam cum duobus flocculis pariter sericis a laeva pendentibus, et Palliolum, seu Mantelletum supra Rocchetum; insuper nigrum biretum flocculo ornatum coloris rubini: pileum item nigrum cum vitta serica, opere reticulato exornata, eiusdem rubini coloris, cuius coloris et serici erunt etiam ocelli, globuli, exiguus torulus collum et anteriores extremitates vestis ac Mantelleti exornans, eorum subsutum, itemque reflexus (paramani) in manicis (etiam Roccheti).

17. Alio autem habitu uti poterunt, Praelatorum proprio, vulgo piano, in Congregationibus, conventibus, solemnibus audientibus, ecclesiasticis et civilibus, idest caligis et collari violacei coloris, veste talari nigra cum ocellis, globulis, torulo ac subsuto, ut supra, rubini coloris, serica zona violacea cum laciniis pariter sericis et violaceis, peramplo pallio talari item serico violaceo, non undulato, absque subsuto aut ornamentis quibusvis alterius coloris, ac pileo nigro cum chordulis et sericis flocculis rubini coloris. Communi habitu incedentes, caligas et collare violacei coloris ac pileum gestare poterunt, ut supra dicitur.

18. Propriis insignibus seu stemmatibus imponere poterunt pileum cum lemniscis ac flocculis duodecim, sex hinc, sex inde pendentibus, eiusdem rubini coloris, sine Cruce vel Mitra.

19. Habitum et insignia in choro Dignitates et Canonici Protonotarii gerent, prout Capitulo ab Apostolica Sede concessa sunt; poterunt nihilominus veste tantum uti violacea praelatitia cum zona sub choralibus insignibus, nisi tamen alia vestis tamquam insigne chorale sit adhibenda. Pro usu Roccheti et Mantelleti in choro attendatur, utrum haec sint speciali indulto permissa; alias enim

Protonotarius, praelatio habitu assistens, neque locum inter Canonicos tenebit, neque distributiones lucrabitur, quae sodalibus accrescent.

20. Cappam laneam violaceam, pellibus ermellini hiberno tempore, aestivo autem rubini coloris serico ornatam, induent in Cappellis Pontificiis, in quibus locum habebunt post Protonotarios Participantes. Ii vero Canonici Protonotarii qui Praelati non sunt, seu nomine tantum Protonotariorum, non vero omnibus iuribus gaudent, ut nn. 13 et 14 dictum est, in Cappellis locum non habebunt, neque ultra limites pontificiae concessionis habitu praelatio et piano, de quibus nn. 16 et 17, uti umquam poterunt.

21. Habitu praelatio induti, clericis quibusvis, Presbyteris, Canonicis, Dignitatibus, etiam collegialiter unitis, atque Praelatis Ordinum Regularium, quibus Pontificalium privilegium non competat, antecedunt, minime vero Vicariis Generalibus vel Capitularibus, Abbatibus, et Canonicis Cathedralium collegialiter sumptis. Ad Crucem et ad Episcopum non genuflectent, sed tantum sese inclinabunt: duplici ductu thurificabuntur: item si sacris vestibus inruti functionibus in choro adsistant.

22. Gaudent indulto Oratorii privati domi rurique, ab Ordinario loci visitandi atque approbandi, in quo, etiam solemnioribus diebus (exceptis Paschatis, Pentecostes, Assumptionis B. M. V., SS. Apostolorum Petri et Pauli, nec non loci Patroni principalis festis) celebrare ipsi Missam poterunt, vel alius Sacerdos, in propriam, consanguineorum, affinium, familiarium et cohabitantium commoditatem, etiam ad praeceptum implendum. Privilegio autem altaris portatilis omnino carere se sciunt.

23. Licet iisdem acta conficere de causis Beatificationis et Canonizationis Servorum Dei, quo tamen privilegio uti non poterunt, si eo loci alter sit e Collegio Protonotariorum Participantium.

24. Rite eliguntur in Conservatores Ordinum Regularium aliorumque piorum Institutorum, in Iudices Synodales, in Commissarios et Iudices Apostolicos etiam pro causis beneficialibus et ecclesiasticis. Item apud ipsos professionem Fidei recte emittunt, qui ex officio ad eam adiguntur. Ut autem iuribus et praerogativis, hic et num. 23 expressis, frui possint Canonici Protonotarii in S. Theologia aut in iure Canonico doctorali laurea insigniti sint oportet.

25. Extra Urbem, et impetrata venia Ordinarii loci, cui erit arbitrium eam tribuendi quoties et pro quibus Solemnitatibus voluerit, atque obtento etiam consensu Praelati ecclesiae exemptae, in qua forte celebrandum sit, pontificali ritu Missas et Vesperas aliasque sacras functiones peragere poterunt. Quod functiones attinet collegialiter, seu Capitulo praesente, celebrandas, a propriis Constitu-

tionibus, de Ordinarii consensu, provideatur, iuxta Apostolica Documenta.

26. Ad ecclesiam accedentes, Pontificalia celebraturi, ab eaque recedentes, habitu praelatitio induti, supra Mantelletum Crucem gestare possunt pectoralem (a qua alias abstinebunt): et nisi privatim per aliam portam ingrediantur, ad fores ecclesiae non excipientur ut Ordinarius loci, sed a Caeremoniario et duobus clericis, non tamen a Canonicis seu Dignitatibus: seipsos tantum aqua lustrali signabunt, tacto aspersione sibi porrecto, et per ecclesiam procedentes populo numquam benedicent.

27. Pontificalia agent ad Falditorium, sed vestes sacras in sacrario assument et deponent, quae in Missis erunt: (a) Caligae et sandalia serica cum orae textu ex auro; (b) Tunicella et Dalmatica; (c) Crux pectoralis sine gemmis, e chordula serica rubina ex integro coloris pendens, auro non intertexta, simili flocculo retro ornata; (d) Chirothecae sericae, sine ullo opere phrygio, sed tantum orae textu auro distinctae; (e) Annulus cum unica gemma; (f) Mitra ex serico albo, sine ullo opere phrygio, sed tantum cum orae textu ex auro, et cum laciniis similiter aureis, quae cum simplici ex lino alternari poterit, iuxta Caerem. Episcoporum. (I., xvii., nn. 2 et 3); haec vero simplex, diebus poenitentialibus et in exsequiis una adhibebitur; (g) Canon et Palmatoria, a qua abstinendum coram Ordinario seu maiori; (h) Urceus et Pelvis cum Mantili in lance; (i) Gremiale.

28. In Vesperis solemnibus (post quas benedictionem non impertientur) aliisque sacris functionibus pontificaliter celebrandis, Mitra, Cruce pectorali, Annulo utentur, ut supra. Pileolus nigri dumtaxat coloris, nonnisi sub Mitra ab eis poterit adhiberi.

29. In pontificalibus functionibus eisdem semper interdicitur usus throni, pastoralis baculi et cappae; in Missis autem pontificalibus, septimo candelabro super altari non utentur, nec plurium Diaconorum assistentia; Presbyterum assistentem pluviali indutum habere poterunt, non tamen coram Episcopo Ordinario aut alio Praesule, qui ipso Episcopo sit maior; intra Missam manus lavabunt ad Ps. Lavabo tantum. Loco Dominus Vobiscum, nunquam dicent Pax vobis; trinam benedictionem impertientur nunquam, nec versus illi praemittent Sit nomen Domini et Adiutorium, sed in Missis tantum pontificalibus, Mitra cooperti, cantabunt formulam Benedicat vos, de more populo benedicentes: a qua benedictione abstinebunt assistente Episcopo loci Ordinario aut alio Praesule, qui ipso Episcopo sit maior, cuius erit eam impertiri. Coram iisdem, in pontificalibus celebrantes, Mitra, simplici solummodo utantur, et dum illi sacra sumunt paramenta, aut solium petunt vel ab eo recedunt stent sine Mitra.

30. De speciali commissione Ordinarii, Missam quoque pro de-

functis pontificali ritu celebrare poterunt Protonotarii Supranumerarii, cum Absolutione in fine, Mitra linea utentes; numquam tamen eandem Absolutionem impertiri illis fas erit, post Missam ab alio celebratam; quod ius uni reservatur Episcopo loci Ordinario.

31. Romae et extra, si ad Missam lectam cum aliqua solemnitate celebrandam accedant, habitu praelatio induti, praeparationem et gratiarum actionem persolvere poterunt ante altare in genuflexorio pulvinaribus tantum instructo, vestes sacras ab altari assumere (non tamen Crucem pectoralem et Annulum) aliquem clericum in Sacris assistentem habere, ac duos inferiores ministros; Canonem et Palmatoriam, Urceum et Pelvim cum Manutergio in lance adhibere; sed ante v. Communio manus ne lavent. In aliis Missis lectis a simplici Sacerdote ne differant, nisi in usu Palmatoriae: in Missis autem cum cantu, sed non pontificalibus, uti poterunt etiam Canone, Urceo cum Pelvi, ac lance ad Manutergium, nisi ex statutis vel consuetudine in propria ecclesia haec prohibeantur.

32. Canonico Protonotario Apostolico Supranumerario pontificalia peragere cum ornamentis ac ritu superius enunciatis fas non erit, nisi infra terminos propriae dioecesis; extra autem, nonnisi ornatu et ritu, prout Protonotariis ad instar, ut infra dicitur, concessum est.

33. Cum tamen Canonicos trium Patriarchalium Urbis, ob earumdem praestantiam, aequum sit excellere privilegiis, eo vel magis quod in Urbe, ob Summi Pontificis praesentiam, Pontificalium privilegium exercere nequeunt, illis permittitur, ut in ecclesiis totius terrarum orbis, impetrata Ordinariorum venia, ac Praesulum ecclesiarum exemptarum consensu, Pontificalia agant cum ritu atque ornamentis nn. 27, 28, 29 recensitis. Insuper, licet aliquis ex ipsis inter praelatos nondum fuerit adscriptus, Palmatoria semper, etiam in privatis Missis uti poterit.

34. Recensita hactenus privilegia illa sunt quibus dumtaxat Protonotarii Apostolici Supranumerarii fruuntur. Verum, cum eadem collective coetui Canonicorum conferantur, Canonici ipsi, tamquam singuli, iis uti nequibunt, nisi Praelati Urbani fuerint nominati et antea suae ad Canonicatum vel Dignitatem promotionis et auspicae iam possessionis, atque inter Praelatos aggregationis, ut num. 14 dicitur, testimonium Collegio Protonotariorum Participantium exhibuerint; coram ipsius Collegii Ducano, vel per se vel per legitimum procuratorem, Fidei professionem et fidelitatis iusiurandum de more praestiterint, ac de his postea, exhibito documento, proprium Ordinarium certiore fecerint. Quibus expletis, eorum nomen in sylloge Protonotariorum Apostolicorum recensebitur.

35. Canonici ecclesiarum extra Urbem, qui ante Nostri huius documenti Motu Proprio editi publicationem, privilegia Protonota-

riorum, una cum Canonicatu, sunt assequuti, ab expeditione Brevis, de quo supra, num. 14, dispensantur; iusiurandum tamen fidelitatis coram Ordinario suo praestabunt infra duos menses.

36. Collegialiter tamquam Canonici pontificalibus functionibus, iuxta Caeremoniale Episcoporum, sacris vestibus induti adsistentes non alia Mitra utantur, quam simplici, nec unquam hoc et ceteris fruuntur Protonotariorum insignibus et privilegiis extra propriam ecclesiam, nisi in diplomate concessionis aliter habeatur. Canonicus tamen qui forte ad ordinem saltem Subdiaconatus non sit promotus, neque in choro cum aliis Mitra unquam utatur. In functionibus autem praedictis inservientem de Mitra non habebunt, prout in Pontificalibus uni Celebranti competit. Qui in Missa solemnī Diaconi, Subdiaconi aut Presbyteri assistentis munus agunt, dum Dignitas, vel Canonicus, aut alter Privilegiarius pontificaliter celebrant, Mitra non utentur; quam tamen adhibere poterunt Episcopo solemniter celebrante, ut distum est de collegialiter adsistentibus, quo in casu, cum ministrant, aut cum Episcopo operantur, maneant detecto capite.

37. Protonotarius Supranumerarius defunctus efferri aut tumulari cum Mitra non poterit, neque haec eius feretro imponi.

38. Ne autem Protonotariorum numerus plus eaquo augeatur, prohibemus, ne in posterum in ecclesiis, de quibus supra, Canonici Honorarii, sive infra, sive extra Dioecesim degant, binas partes excedant eorum, qui Capitulum iure constituunt.

39. Qui secus facere, aliisve, praeter memorata, privilegiis et iuribus uti praesumpserint, si ab Ordinario semel et bis admoniti non paruerint, eo ipso, Protonotariatus titulo, honore, iuribus et privilegiis, tamquam singuli, privatos se noverint.

40. Sciant praeterea, se, licet forte plures una simul, non tamquam unius ecclesiae Canonici, sed tamquam Protonotarii conveniant, non idcirco Collegium praelatitium constitui; verum quando una cum Protonotariis de numero Participantium concurrunt, v. gr. in Pontificia Capella, tunc quasi unum corpus cum ipsis effecti censentur, sine ullo tamen amplissimi Collegii praeiudicio, ac servatis eiusdem Cappellae et Familiae Pontificiae consuetudinibus.

41. Si quis (exceptis Canonici trium Patriarchalium Urbis) quavis ex causa Dignitatem aut Canonicatum dimittat, cui titulus, honor et praerogativae Protonotarii Apostolici Supranumerarii adnexa sint, ab eiusmodi titulo, honore et praerogativis statim decidet. Qui vero Pontificium Breve inter Praelatos aggregationis obtinuerit, horum tantum privilegiis deinceps perfruetur.

III.—PROTONOTARII APOSTOLICI AD INSTAR.

42. Inter Protonotarios Apostolicos ad instar Participantium illi

virī ecclesiastici adnumerantur, quibus Apostolica Sedes hunc honorem conferre voluerit, ac praeterea Dignitates et Canonici alicuius Capituli praestantioris, quibus collegialiter titulus et privilegia Protonotariorum, cum addito ad instar, ubique utenda, fuerint ab eadem Apostolica Sede collata. Canonici enim qui aut in propria tantum ecclesia vel dioecesi titulo Protonotarii aucti sunt, aut nonnullis tantum Protonotariorum privilegiis fuerunt honestati, neque Protonotariis aliisve Praelatis Urbanis accensebuntur, neque secus habebuntur ac illi de quibus hoc in Nostro documento nn. 80 et 81 erit sermo.

43. Qui Protonotarii Apostolici ad instar tamquam singuli iuribus honorantur, eo ipso sunt Praelati Domus Pontificiae; qui vero ideo sunt Protonotarii quia alicuius ecclesiae Canonici, Praelatis Domesticis non adnumerantur, nisi per Breve Pontificium ut num. 14 dictum est. Omnes Protonotarii ad instar subiecti remanent, ad iuris tramitem, Ordinario loci.

44. Beneficia illorum, qui Protonotarii ad instar titulo et honore gaudent tamquam Canonici alicuius Capituli, si vacent extra Romanam Curiam, Apostolicae Sedi minime reservantur. Beneficia vero eorum, qui tali titulo et honore fruuntur, tamquam privata persona, non poterunt nisi ab Apostolica Sede conferri.

45. Quod pertinet ad habitum praelatitium, pianum et communem, stemmata et choralia insignia, habitum et locum in Pontificia Capella, omnia observabunt, uti supra dictum est de Protonotariis Supranumerariis, nn. 16, 17, 18, 19, 20.

46. Iisdem iuribus gaudebunt, praecedentiae, privati oratorii, conficiendi acta Beatificationis et Canonizationis, passivae electionis in Conservatores, ceterisque; item recipiendae Fidei professionis reverentiae ad Crucem, thurificationis, quibus omnibus fruuntur Protonotarii Supranumerarii, ut supra nn. 21, 22, 23, 24, ac iisdem sub conditionibus.

47. De venia Ordinarii et Praesulis consensu ecclesiae exemptae, extra Urbem, Missas, non tamen de requie, pontificali ritu et ornatu celebrare poterunt, prout supra notatur, ubi de Protonotariis Supranumerariis, nn. 25, 26, 27, 28, 29; verum his legibus: Nec Faldistorio nec Gremiali unquam utantur, sed una cum Ministris in scamno, cooperto panno coloris diei, sedeant; caligis et sandaliis utantur sericis tantum, cum ore textu item serico flavi coloris ornato, et similiter sericis chirothecis sine alio ornamento; Mitra simplici ex serico damasceno, nullo ornamento, ne in oris quidem distincta, cum rubris laciniis ad vittas. Extra Cathedrales Ecclesias tantum, assistentem Presbyterum habere poterunt pluviali indutum, dummodo non assistat Episcopus Ordinarius aut alius Praesul ipso Episcopo maior. Crucem pectoralem auream sine gemmis gerent,

appensam funiculo serico violacei ex integro coloris, auro non intertexto. Omnia, quae in Missa cantanda vel legenda sunt, nunquam ad scamnum, sed ad altare cantabunt et legent. Manus infra Missam lavent tantum ad Ps. Lavabo.

48. Poterunt insuper, pariter extra Urbem, de venia Ordinarii et cum Praesulis ecclesiae exemptae consensu, Mitra, Cruce pectorali et Annulo ornati, ad scamnum, more Presbyterorum, celebrare Vesperas illius festi, cuius Missam ipsi pontificaliter acturi sint, vel peregerint (absque benedictione in fine). Iisdem ornamentis eodemque ritu uti licebit, de speciali tamen commissione Ordinarii, in Vesperis festi, cuius Missa in pontificalibus ab alio quolibet Praelato celebretur, itemque in benedictione cum Sanctissimo Sacramento solemniter (non tamen trine) impertienda, in Processionibus, et in una ex quinque absolutionibus in solemnioribus exsequiis, de quibus in Pontificali Romano.

49. Romae Missam lectam, aliqua cum solemnitate celebrantes, si praelatio habitu sint induti, ea retineant, quae de Protonotariis Supranumerariis n. 31 constituta sunt; extra Urbem, de speciali tamen commissione Ordinarii, eodem modo se gerent; aliis in Missis et functionibus, tamquam Praelati Domestici, ut n. 78, Palmatoriam tantum, si velint, adhibeant.

50. Qui Canonicorum coetui adscriptus, cui hactenus recnsita Protonotariorum ad instar privilegia concessa sint, tamquam privata persona iisdem uti velit, prius Breve Pontificium, ut dicitur nn. 14 et 43, de sua inter Praelatos Domesticos aggregatione, servatis servandis, obtineat, simulque suae ad Canonicatum vel Dignitatem promotionis, initaeque possessionis ac inter Praelatos aggregationis testimonium Collegio Protonotariorum Participantium exhibeat. Tum coram ipsius Collegii Decano, vel per se vel per legitimum procuratorem, Fidei professionem ac fidelitatis iusiurandum, de more, praestet; de his denique exhibito documento proprium Ordinarium certiore faciat. Qui vero tamquam privata persona huiusmodi titulum rite fuerit consecutus, non ante privilegiis eidem titulo adnexis uti poterit, quam legitimum suae nominationis testimonium memorato Collegio exhibuerit, Fidei professionem et fidelitatis iusiurandum, uti supra, ediderit, de hisque omnibus authenticum documentum suo Ordinario attulerit. Haec ubi praestiterint, eorum nomen in sylloge Protonotariorum recensebitur.

51. Qui ante has Litteras, Motu Proprio editas, iuribus gaudebant Protonotarii ad instar, tamquam alicuius ecclesiae Canonici, a postulatione Brevis, de quo in superiori numero, dispensantur, quemadmodum et a iureiurando, ut ibidem dicitur, praestando, quod tamen proprio Ordinario infra duos menses dabunt.

52. Habitum et insignia in choro Dignitates et Canonici Pro-

tonotarii gerent, prout Capitulo ab Apostolica Sede concessa sunt; poterunt nihilominus veste tantum uti violacea praelatitia cum zona sub choralibus insignibus, nisi tamen alia vestis, tamquam insigne chorale sit adhibenda. Pro usu Roccheti et Mantelleti in choro attendatur, utrum haec sint speciali indulto permissa; alias enim Protonotarius, habitu praelatitio assistens, neque locum inter Canonicos tenebit, neque distributiones acquires, quae sodalibus accrescent.

53. Collegialiter tamquam Canonici pontificalibus functionibus, iuxta Caeremoniale Episcoporum, sacris vestibus induti assistentes, non alia Mitra utentur quam simplici, nec unquam hoc aliisve supra memoratis insignibus et privilegiis extra propriam ecclesiam, nisi in concessionis diplomate aliter habeatur. Canonicus tamen, qui forte ad ordinem saltem Subdiaconatus non sit promotus, ne in choro quidem cum aliis Mitra unquam utatur. In functionibus autem praedictis inservientem de Mitra non habebunt, prout in Pontificalibus uni Celebranti competit. Qui in Missa solemnii Diaconi, Subdiaconi aut Presbyteri assistentis munus agunt, dum Dignitas, vel Canonicus, aut alter Privilegiarius pontificaliter celebrant, Mitra non utentur; quam tamen adhibere poterunt, Episcopo solemniter celebrante, ut dictum est de collegialiter adsistentibus, quo in casu, cum ministrant, aut cum Episcopo operantur, maneant detecto capite.

54. Protonotarius ad instar defunctus efferri aut tumulari cum Mitra non poterit, nec eius feretro ipsa imponi.

55. Ne autem Protonotariorum numerus plus aequo augeatur, prohibemus, ne in posterum in ecclesiis, de quibus supra, Canonici Honorarii, sive infra, sive extra Dioecesim degant, binas partes excedant eorum, qui Capitulum iure constituunt.

56. Qui secus facere, aliisve, praeter memorata, privilegiis et iuribus uti praesumpserint, si ab Ordinario semel et bis admoniti non paruerint, eo ipso, Protonotariatus titulo, honore, iuribus et privilegiis, tamquam singuli, privatos se noverint.

57. Sciant praeterea; se, licet forte plures una simul, non tamquam unius ecclesiae Canonici, sed tamquam Protonotarii, conveniant, non idcirco Collegium Praelatitium constituere; verum, quando una cum Protonotariis de numero Participantium concurrant, v. gr. in Pontificiis Cappellis, tunc quasi unum corpus cum ipsis censentur, sine ullo tamen amplissimi Collegii praeiudicio, ac servatis eiusdem Cappellae et Familiae Pontificiae consuetudinibus.

58. Si quis, quavis ex causa, Dignitatem aut Canonicatum dimittat, cui titulus, honor et praerogativae Protonotariorum ad instar adnexa sint, statim ab iisdem titulo, honore et praerogativis decedet. Qui vero Pontificium Breve inter Praelatos aggregationis obtinuerit, horum tantum privilegiis deinceps perfruetur.

IV.—PROTONOTARII APOSTOLICI TITULARES SEU HONORARIJ.

59. Cum Apostolica Sedes, non sibi uni ius reservaverit Protonotarios Titulares seu honorarios nominandi, sed Nuntiis Apostolicis, Collegio Protonotariorum Participantium et forte aliis iamdiu illud delegaverit, antequam de eorum privilegiis ac praerogativis aliquid decernamus, leges seu conditiones renovare placet, quibus rite honesteque ad eiusmodi dignitatem quisque Candidatus valeat evehi, iuxta Pii PP. VII. Praedecessoris Nostri Constitutionem "Cum innumeri," Idibus Decembr. MDCCCXVIII. datam.

60. Quoties igitur de honorario Protonotariatu assequendo postulatio praebeatur, proferantur, ab Ordinario recognita, testimonia, quibus constet indubie: (1) de honesta familiae conditione; (2) de aetate saltem annorum quinque et viginti; (3) de statu clericali ac caelib; (4) de Laurea doctoris in utroque, aut canonico tantum iure, vel in S. Theologia, vel in S. Scriptura; (5) de morum honestate et gravitate, ac de bona apud omnes aestimatione; (6) de non communibus in Ecclesiae bonum provehendum laudibus comparatis; (7) de idoneitate ad Protonotariatum cum decore sustinendum, habita etiam annui census ratione, iuxta regionis cuiusque aestimationem.

61. Quod si huiusmodi Protonotariatus honor alicui Canonicorum coetui collective ab Apostolica Sede conferatur (quod ius, collective Protonotarios nominandi, nemini censi posse delegatum declaramus), eo ipso, quo quis Dignitatem aut Canonicatum est legitime consequutus, Protonotarius nuncupabitur.

62. Pariter, qui Vicarii Generalis aut etiam Capitularis munere fungitur, hoc munere dumtaxat perdurante, erit Protonotarius Titularis; hinc, si Dignitate aut Canonicatu in Cathedrali non gaudeat, quando choro interesse velit, habitu Protonotarii praelatio, qui infra describitur, iure utetur.

63. Protonotarii Apostolici Titulares sunt Praelati extra Urbem, qui tamen subiecti omnino manent locorum Ordinariis, Praelatorum Domus Pontificiae honoribus non gaudent, neque inter Summi Pontificis Familiares adnumerantur.

64. Extra Urbem, dummodo Summus Pontifex eo loci non adsit, in sacris functionibus rite utuntur habitu praelatio, nigri ex integro coloris, idest veste talari, etiam, si libeat, cum cauda (nunquam tamen explicanda), zona serica cum duobus flocculis a laeva pendentibus, Roccheto, Mantelletto et bireto, absque ulla horum omnino parte, subsuto aut ornamento alterius coloris.

65. Extra Urbem, praesente Summo Pontifice, descripto habitu indui possunt, si hic tamquam chorale insigne concessus sit, vel si quis uti Vicarius adfuerit.

66. Habitu praelatio induti, omnibus Clericis, Presbyteris, etiam

Canonicis, singulatim sumptis, praeferantur, non vero Canonicis, etiam Collegiatarum, collegialiter convenientibus, neque Vicariis Generalibus et Capitularibus, aut Superioribus Generalibus Ordinum Regularium, et Abbatibus, ac Praelatis Romanae Curiae; non genuflectunt ad Crucem vel ad Episcopum, sed tantum se inclinant, ac duplici ductu thurificantur.

67. Super habitu quotidiano, occasione sollemnis conventus, audientiae et similium, etiam Romae et coram Summo Pontifice, zonam tantum sericam nigram, cum laciniis item nigris, gestare poterunt, cum pileo chordula ac floccis nigris ornato.

68. Propriis insignibus, seu stemmatibus, pileum imponere valeant, sed nigrum tantummodo, cum lemnis et sex hinc sex inde flocculis pendentibus, item ex integro nigris.

69. Si quis Protonotarius Titularis, Canonicatus aut Dignitatis ratione, choro intersit, circa habitum se gerat iuxta normas Protonotariis ad instar constitutas, num. 52, vestis colore excepto.

70. Sacris operantes, a simplicibus Sacerdotibus minime differant; attamen extra Urbem in Missis et Vesperis sollemnibus, pariterque in Missis lectis aliisque functionibus sollemnibus aliquando celebrandis, Palmatoria tantum ipsis utenda conceditur, excluso Canone aliave pontificali suppellectili.

71. Quod pertinet ad acta in causis Beatificationis et Canonizationis, et ad passivam electionem in Conservatores ac cetera, iisdem iuribus gaudent, quibus fruuntur Protonotarii Supranumerarii, uti nn. 23 et 24 supra dictum est.

72. Beneficia eorum qui, tamquam privatae personae, Protonotariatum Titularem assequuti sunt, non vero qui ratione Vivariatus, Canonicatus sive Dignitatis eodem gaudent, ab Apostolica tantum Sede conferantur.

73. Noverint autem, se, licet forte plures una simul, non tamquam unius ecclesiae Canonici, sed tamquam Protonotarii, convenient, non ideo Collegium constituere.

74. Tandem qui Protonotariatu Apostolico honorario donati sunt, tamquam privatae personae, titulo, honoribus, et privilegiis Protonotariatus uti nequeunt, nisi antea diploma suae nominationis Collegio Protonotariorum Participantium exhibuerint, Fideique professionem, ac fidelitatis iusiurandum coram Ordinario, aut alio viro in ecclesiastica dignitate constituto emisierint. Qui vero ob Canonicatum, Dignitatem, aut Vicariatum, eo potiti fuerint, nisi idem praestiterint, memoratis honoribus et privilegiis, quae superius recensentur, tantummodo intra propriae dioecesis limites uti poterunt.

75. Qui secus facere, aliisque, praeter descripta, privilegiis uti praesumpserint, si ab Ordinario semel et bis admoniti non paruerint,

eo ipso honore et iuribus Protonotarii privatos se sciant: quod si Protonotariatum, tamquam privata persona adepti sint, etiam titulo.

76. Vicarii Generales vel Capitulares, itemque Dignitates et Canonici nomine atque honoribus Protonotariatus titularis gaudentes, si, quavis ex causa, a munere, Dignitate aut Canoniatu cessent, eo ipso, titulo, honoribus et iuribus ipsius Protonotariatus excident.

B.—DE CETERIS PRAELATIS ROMANAE CURIAE.

77. Nihil detractum volumus honoribus, privilegiis, praeeminentiis, praerogativis, quibus alia Praelatorum Romanae Curiae Collegia, Apostolicae Sedis placito, exornantur.

78. Insuper concedimus, ut omnes et singuli Praelati Urbani seu Domestici, etsi nulli Collegio adscripti, ii nempe, qui tales renunciati, Breve Apostolicum obtinuerint, Palmatoria uti possint (non vero Canone aut alia pontificali suppellectili) in Missa cum cantu, vel etiam lecta, cum aliqua solemnitate celebranda; item in Vesperis aliisque solemnibus functionibus.

79. Hi autem habitum, sive praelatitium sive quem vocant pianum, gestare poterunt, iuxta Romanae Curiae consuetudinem, prout supra describitur nn. 16, 17; numquam tamen vestis talaris caudam explicare, neque sacras vestes ex altari assumere valeant, nec alio uti colore, quam violaceo, in bireti flocculo et pilei vitta, opere reticulato distincta, sive chordulis et flocculis, etiam in pileo stemmatibus imponendo ut n. 18 dictum est, nisi, pro eorum aliquo, constet de maiori particulari privilegio.

C.—DE DIGNITATIBUS, CANONICIS ET ALIIS, QUI NONNULLIS PRIVILEGIIS PRAELATORUM PROPRIIS FRUUNTUR.

80. Ex Romanorum Pontificum indulgentia, insignia quaedam praelatitia aut pontificalia aliis Collegiis, praesertim Canonorum, eorumve Dignitatibus, quocumque nomine nuncupentur, vel a priscis temporibus tribui consueverunt; cum autem eiusmodi privilegia deminutionem quamdam episcopali dignitati videantur afferre, idcirco ea sunt de iure strictissime interpretanda. Huic principio inhaerentes, expresse volumus, ut in pontificalium usu nemini ad aliquod ex supra memoratis Collegiis pertinenti in posterum ampliora suffragentur privilegia, quam quae, superius descripta, competunt Protonotariis sive Supranumerariis, sive ad instar, et quidem non ultra propriae ecclesiae, aut ad summum Dioeceseos, si hoc fuerit concessum, limites; neque ultra dies iam designatos, aut determinatas functiones; et quae arctiora sunt, ne augeantur.

81. Quoniam vero de re agitur haud parvi momenti, quippe quae ecclesiasticam respicit disciplinam, ne quis audeat arbitraria interpretatione, maiora quam in concedentis voluntate fuerint, sibi privilegia vindicare; quin potius paratum sese ostendat, quatenus illa excesserint, minoribus coarctari; singulis locorum Ordinariis, quorum sub iurisdictione vel quorum in territorio, si de exemptis agatur, aliquis ex praedictis coetibus inveniatur, demandamus, ut, tamquam Apostolicae Sedis Delegati, Apostolicarum Concessionum documenta ipsis faventia, circa memorata privilegia, infra bimestre tempus, ab hisce Nostris Ordinationibus promulgatis, sub poena immediatae amissionis eorum quae occultaverint, ad se transmitti curent, quae intra consequentem mensem ad Nostram SS. Rituum Congregationem mittant. Haec autem, pro suo munere, omnia et singula hisce Nostris dispositionibus aptans, declarabit et decernet, quatenam in posterum illis competant.

Haec omnia rata et firma consistere auctoritate Nostra volumus et iubemus; contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, die 21 Februarii MCMV., Pontificatus Nostri anno secundo.

PIUS PP. X.

Scientific Chronicle

PHYSIOLOGICAL ECONOMY IN NUTRITION.

Under the above title Dr. Russell Chittenden, director of the Sheffield Scientific School of Yale University, has published a book which is remarkable not only for the record of patient investigation which it contains, but still more for the conclusions to which these investigations lead. It is a resumé of an elaborate series of dietary studies which had for their object to determine what was the amount of food requisite to keep the body in health and vigor. Many so-called dietary standards had been proposed, as those, for instance, of Atwater and Voit, but they had been computed from observations made upon men who were consuming an amount of food which it was not at all evident they stood in need of. The excess in their rations would be worked off by the digestive and excretory organs of the body, but with a waste of energy; for all this work would not make for the nourishment of the body and, as far as nutrition was concerned, was of little or no use. To prevent this waste was to establish physiological economy, in which all the organs concerned in nourishing the body were not overburdened by food-stuffs of no value, and often of positive harm, but accomplished just the amount of work necessary for the assimilation of food at a rate sufficient to keep up normal health and strength. If this economy could be brought about, it would mean longer life for the organs in question by the removal of the unnatural strain upon them; it would mean the reduction of diseases consequent on such strain and on the almost certain formation of deleterious substances within the body from the fermentation of the surplus food.

The hitherto accepted standard rations called for about one-fourth of a pound each of fat and protein and a pound of carbo-hydrates. Of these the most important is the protein; indeed, the metabolism of protein may be taken as an index of the nutrition of the body. Now in the amount of protein of the standard ration, about 113 grams, there are about 18 grams of nitrogen. This means that under the standard ration a man doing average muscular labor would consume 18 grams of nitrogen. Dr. Chittenden asks is such an amount of nitrogen necessary; and his experiments show conclusively, we think, that it is not, for with men consuming one-half the amount of protein in the standard dietary the body was putting on nitrogen and there was no loss of health and vigor. There was

an evident physiological economy, and the labor of rejecting the surplus protein was saved. But it is time to explain briefly the doctor's method of procedure.

Beginning with himself, the doctor gradually reduced the amount of his food until at the end of two or three months he was living on half the standard ration. There was no loss of bodily or mental vigor. On the contrary, there was an almost entire absence of fatigue, accompanied by the disappearance of a periodic ailment, which did not reappear, while there was present a feeling of exhilaration and pleasure in labor not felt before. Moreover, in taking bodily exercise there was a sense of power and a power of endurance never before experienced or suspected. Dr. Chittenden realized that these symptoms did not necessarily mean that his body was sufficiently nourished. It was remarkable, however, that he was to all appearances thriving on this low proteid diet, his body weight decreasing slightly in the beginning of the experiment and then remaining practically constant. The small loss was attributed to the disappearance of surplus flesh. To determine if the body was putting on nitrogen, for a week every bit of food taken was analyzed and the amount of nitrogen determined. Upon examination it was found that the amount excreted was less than the amount taken in. There was an undoubted nitrogen balance in favor of the body.

Obviously this one experiment, albeit remarkable, would not suffice to draw a general conclusion from. Similar experiments were performed on four gentlemen of the instructing and administrative departments of the university with like results. Then six athletes, students of the university, were experimented upon, and the results went to confirm the doctor's personal experiment. Finally a detail of thirteen enlisted men from the U. S. Hospital Service went through a similar experience with the same striking results. The salient points of all these experiments are the following:

1. The experiments extended over a period of five or six months. Occasionally this number was exceeded.
2. The amount of food was gradually reduced, and there was no selection of particular foods. Everything the appetite craved was supplied; there was no insistence on particular kinds of diet; temperance and not abstention was the rule.
3. The body weight usually fell slightly in the beginning and then remained constant.
4. General health showed marked improvement. During the term of his restricted diet one of the athletes won the intercollegiate all-round championship. Each one of the soldiers doubled his

muscular strength during the term, when vigorous muscular exercise was indulged in daily for several hours. One, in fact, tripled his muscular strength, and all testified to the great benefit they had derived in every way.

5. At the end of the term a marked repugnance was felt in all cases to a return to former habits. Under the restricted diet the food taken had a new relish.

6. At intervals careful determinations of the input and outgo of nitrogen were made, and there was always a plus balance in favor of the body.

Lest it be thought that the nervous and sensory systems might have suffered harm, it should be mentioned that the most scrupulous examination by the latest approved methods failed to detect any. The composition of the blood was examined, and it was found that it suffered no deterioration. In brief, all the advantages were on the side of the restricted diet, and there were no facts deducible from the experiments to militate against it. Letters to Dr. Chittenden from a large number of persons who have adopted the practice he recommends all testify to the great benefit derived from it. It will be interesting to know just how far his views regarding diet will prevail. They cannot be overlooked in subsequent dietary studies. If they are found to be correct, we shall be delivered, in part at least, from the slavery to our cooks, under which it is said we all labor. It is scarcely necessary to speak of the great economy of time and money that must ensue, if we can live at least as vigorously and with as good health as now on half as much food and drink.

THE DEPLETION OF NIAGARA FALLS.

A great deal of discussion has been raised recently over the attempt of a few capitalists to obtain extensive privileges in using the water of Niagara Falls for generating power. Not so many years ago we enthused over the vast projects conceived for this same purpose, for we thought of the good that would result from the cheapening of electrical energy and the consequent cheapening of the necessities of life that could be thereby manufactured. But we had no idea that this would mean the practical destruction of the Falls; no idea that water enough would be diverted into the tunnels of the power companies to make any appreciable difference in the flow over the escarpment. We may be surprised to learn that some observers who have lived near the Falls and have seen them

for years honestly believe that there has been already a visible decrease. We shall most certainly be surprised to know that there is proximate danger of the entire depletion of the American Falls. If this takes place, may not the depletion of the Canadian Falls follow from the same cause?

In the *Popular Science Monthly* for April, 1905, Dr. John M. Clarke, New York State geologist, gives a few facts which show this proximate danger. According to the generally accepted figures, 224,000 cubic feet of water flow over the falls in one second. Only one-fourth of this water flows over the American Falls. Now, it so happens that the sill or edge of the Falls is ten feet higher on the American than on the Canadian side, making the waters on the American side ten feet shallower. Taking both these facts into consideration, it will be easily seen that the abstraction of water from above the Falls will make itself felt on the American side first. The amount of abstraction necessary to bring down the level of the water to the edge of the sill on the American side has been calculated by a competent engineer to be 40,000 cubic feet per second. If this amount reach 80,000 cubic feet, the American Falls will be dry. Is there any prospect that this amount will be reached?

There are two American and three Canadian companies which have charter rights to utilize 48,000 cubic feet of water per second. These five companies are already operating or about to operate. This means that the water level will soon reach the rock bottom at the American edge of the Falls. Besides this, there is another company with an *unrestricted* charter, which may be relied upon, if it begins operations, to utilize not less than 10,000 cubic feet of water; and a proposal has been made by which four companies on the Canadian side will utilize 29,996 cubic feet. The aggregate, 87,996 cubic feet of water per second, if diverted from its course, will leave the American Falls dry.

No lover of the beauties of nature can contemplate this threatened destruction without sadness and indignation. It is the project of men who see no use in the Falls except a commercial one. There is no thought of the hundreds of thousands of tourists who visit the cataract every year. The editor of the *Scientific American* calls this a spirit of brutal utilitarianism, and says there is no warrant for this destruction, since "equal energy can be developed in other ways, such as utilizing less important waterfalls or by burning bituminous coals under steam boilers." Dr. Clarke points out that since "the working companies are established in their rights," we must find a remedy that will respect these rights and yet save the Falls. He says: "Protection for Niagara means control of power production." He continues: "In taxation of the power product, not

necessarily for revenue, but for protection, seems to me to lie the sole means of control of the problem, the only way of saving our national pride before the bar of the world."

Mr. Alton D. Adams, in the *Engineering Magazine* for June, suggests a remedy of a different nature. He points out that the Niagara river in descending 100 feet from the base of the great cataract to the foot of the escarpment at Lewiston and Queenston, five miles down stream, develops 2,500,000 horse-power, and he goes on to show how by a system of tunnels, or by damming the river at Lewiston, horse-power sufficient could be utilized to "provide all the energy that could be utilized within 300 miles of the Falls in at least the next half century."

SOME MORE STIMULANTS TO PLANT GROWTH.

In the April QUARTERLY we described a method of forcing plants by means of anæsthetics. Two new methods have recently attracted attention. The first utilizes electricity, the second the light afforded by burning acetylene. That electricity had some influence on plant growth seems to have been first suggested by the fact that within the zone of action of the aurora borealis, a violent electrical manifestation as is well known, there is a luxuriant vegetation, although the conditions usually thought requisite, such as abundance of sunlight and heat, are absent. In 1885 Professor Lemstrom, of Helsingfors, made a series of experiments in which he submitted seeds in pots to the influence of a static electric machine, connecting one pole with the soil in the pot and the other with a cage of wire netting placed over it. Inside of a week the growth showed greater vigor over that of similar but untreated seed. In eight weeks there was a difference in favor of the treated seeds of forty per cent. Field experiments were then made, and, although some contradictory results were obtained, increases of from 30 to 125 per cent. for various plants were manifest. Suitable climate, plenty of water, rich soil and abundant manuring were found to be essential. Later investigators worked with seeds before germination and got favorable results, one striking fact being that dry seeds were not affected, the effect of the electricity apparently being to stimulate the action of the moisture, which of itself is a factor in promoting germination.

Through motives of economy Lemstrom in 1898 was led to try the effect of atmospheric electricity upon plants. He began by covering a portion of a field with wire netting, which shielded the

plants beneath from the action of the electricity in the atmosphere. The adjacent plants, which were uncovered, showed an increase of fifty or sixty per cent. in growth and fruitfulness over the covered ones. A cheaper method, which is nevertheless almost too expensive to have wide usefulness, was devised by Lagrange and Paulins, and consisted of placing galvanized iron rods among the plants, the rods serving as conductors. This method had great success, and with the others shows great promise of future utility, especially when applied to the cultivation of fruits, flowers and vegetables under glass.

Acetylene gaslight has been shown spectroscopically to bear a close resemblance to sunlight. Might it not then act somewhat as sunlight does in affecting plant growth? Professors Bailey and Craig, of Cornell University, have shown that it does so act. In one series of experiments two sets of plants were taken. Both were exposed to sunlight during the day, and at night one was kept in the dark, while the other was kept under acetylene light. To quote the *Acetylene Journal*: "It is seen that thirty-seven radishes on the light or acetylene side of the curtain aggregated 136 grams, as against thirty-eight radishes on the dark side reaching but 61 grams, less than half. The behavior of peas, under which blooms and good-sized pods were present by the aid of acetylene, at a time when without this not even buds were apparent, is equally marked." It may be added in conclusion that striking results were also obtained with plants never exposed to the action of the sun's rays.

The commercial application of these two methods is a problem awaiting solution.

ALCOHOL FROM SAWDUST.

Alcohol is usually manufactured from the starch contained in potatoes, rice and other grains. The first step in the process is the conversion of the starch into glucose by heating it with sulphuric acid, which is afterwards neutralized with chalk, or into maltose by mixing it with an infusion of malt. The glucose or maltose is then fermented with yeast, the product being distilled and the resulting alcohol rectified. Woody fibre, paper, linen and other substances having the same empirical formula as starch, if acted on by sulphuric acid will yield glucose, from which alcohol may be prepared. Knowing this, Mr. Broeconnet in 1819 obtained glucose from cellulose, but found great difficulty in separating the sulphuric acid; at least

he found the process of separation too costly to render the manufacture commercially profitable.

Professor Alexander Classen, of Aix-la-Chapelle, has succeeded in utilizing the cellulose in sawdust by using gaseous sulphurous acid which can be easily driven off at a moderate heat. The process is briefly as follows: The sawdust is packed in a revolving iron cylinder lined with lead, and to the sawdust is added one-third of its weight of sulphurous acid dissolved in water, the temperature of the cylinder being thereupon raised to about 295 degrees F. The gas is driven out of the water into the wood, on which it acts, converting it into glucose or grape sugar in about three hours. The sulphurous acid and steam are then blown off, the converted sawdust passed into exhausting batteries, where the sugar is dissolved out, and the solution thus resulting is neutralized as far as necessary with carbonate of lime. Two kinds of sugar are present—pentose, which is non-fermentable, and from seventy to eighty per cent. of glucose, which is fermented and distilled in the accepted way. A large industrial plant for the manufacture of alcohol in this way has been erected. Experts think that all our alcohol will eventually be made by this process. The washed out residue from the exhausters can be used for fuel and even for manufacturing wood alcohol.

NOTES.

A NEW ANAESTHETIC.—From a French journal comes the announcement of a new and painless anæsthetic. It is a liquid, is obtained from a plant in Japan and is called "scopolamine." Administered by hypodermic injection, it will induce sleep for eight or nine hours, has no after effects and is said to be far superior to any other drug used for the same purpose.

RECENT EXPLORATIONS OF THE ATMOSPHERE.—The problem of the circulation of the currents of the upper air is one difficult of solution. Some success has been attained in using kites for exploration; but a more promising method is the use of "ballons-sonders," which are small balloons inflated with about one hundred cubic feet of hydrogen, which expand as they rise and burst at a certain height. They carry up with them self-recording instruments which register the temperature, barometric pressure, etc. The fall is gradual, owing to a parachute attachment. Such balloons have been used in Europe during the last ten years. They were used for the first time in this country on the occasion of the "aeronautical concourse" at St. Louis, under the direction of Mr. A. Lawrence

Rotch, director of the Blue Hill Observatory, and Colonel J. A. Ockerson, chief of the Department of Liberal Arts. To each instrument is attached directions to the finder to send it either to St. Louis or Blue Hill, under promise of reward. Twice the height of nine or ten miles and a temperature of 68 degrees F. below zero was attained in September. In November temperatures of 72 and 76 degrees below zero were reached. Three balloons traveled more than two hundred miles and two attained a speed exceeding one hundred miles an hour, always towards the east. Experiments are to be continued.

THE WORLD'S COAL SUPPLY.—Not long since we began to grow alarmed over the prospect of a cessation of the world's supply of coal. Listen to these facts. In a recent report the Royal Commission states that there is underlying the United Kingdom 100,914,668,167 tons of coal, at a depth of less than 4,000 feet and in seams a foot and above in thickness, these being so-called "proved" coal fields. In unproved fields at less than 4,000 feet the estimate of the amount of coal is 40,000,000,000 tons. In proved coal fields below 4,000 feet the estimate gives 5,239,000,000 tons, and over one billion tons off the coast of Cumberland and South Wales below the sea bed. During the last thirty-four years Great Britain mined five and three-quarter million tons. If we take the 140,000,000,000 tons in the proved beds, we see we have about twenty-five times the amount mined still untouched. At the rate given for the last thirty-four years this ought to last 850 years, and although the rate of consumption will increase in the future, oil fuel and water-power are going to do a large share of the work. Now, the total square mileage of the coal areas of the world is 471,800. Of this Great Britain has 9,000 square miles. If we may take Great Britain as an index, it would seem that we need have no fear of a coal famine.

M. J. AHERN, S. J.

Boston, Mass.

Book Reviews

ESAME CRITICO DELLE XL. PROPOSIZIONE ROSMINIANE CONDANNATE DALLA S. R. M. INQUISIZIONE. Studi filosofico-teologico di un laico. *Giuseppe Morando.* Milano: L. F. Cogliati, Editore. 1905.

This volume, divided into two parts, the first cxxxvii. pages, the second 958 pages, is at once an apology for Rosmini and his adherents and an effort to prove that the condemnation of the XL. Propositions was due to a misunderstanding of them. The English-speaking reader of the first part of Mr. Morando's work will be reminded of another apology, because of the method employed by the present author to justify Rosmini.

It will be remembered that in his attack upon Newman Kingsley endeavored to throw such discredit upon the great convert to the Church that any answer from Newman would be taken to be unworthy of belief. Kingsley asserted that the Church, or at least certain Catholic moralists, authorized a person attacked to employ lying as a defense.

Mr. Morando's method of defense in the case of Rosmini consists in an effort to minimize the value of a condemnation by a Roman congregation, and this position he endeavors to establish by calling repeated attention to the case of Galilei. In addition, the author seeks to show that the Jesuits, who were the chief opponents of Rosmini, were unfair to him personally and perverted his doctrines in order to bring about their condemnation. He further dwells upon the friendship existing between Gregory XVI. and Rosmini and the mild judgment of the congregation upon the XL. Propositions in the time of Pius IX. Mr. Morando enlarges upon the opposition to Rosmini and points out that one of his principal antagonists was the Nuncio at Brussels, Gioacchino Pecci, later on Leo XIII.

Speaking of this last named personage the author permits himself to employ the following language, p. xxvi.: "I precedenti di Papa Pecci e le sue private opinioni erano talmente cosa notoria che un publicista fiorentino, David Norsa, alla notizia della sua elevazione fu udito in pubblico esclamare: 'Questo è il Papa che condannerà Rosmini!'" Mr. Morando has not a little to say about the reverence and the respect for the Church and her authorities entertained by not only Rosmini, but, too, by Rosmini's disciples. Possibly the epithet "Papa Pecci" is indicative.

Indeed, the entire first part of the volume is an exhibition of

intense feeling against all the opponents of Rosmini, and contains more than a suggestion that the opposition was insincere.

The Apology has all the marks of a brief drawn up by an advocate. The brief is in many respects very clever, but the bias is too visible to make it effective with a reader without any leaning one way or the other in the case under consideration. The second part of the work is exceedingly well done in form. Each Proposition is presented. Then follows an exposition of the sense in which it is understood by its opponents; and, finally, there is offered the meaning attached to the Proposition by the Rosminians.

To present the particulars of the examination of any of the condemned Propositions here would require too much space. It may be noted, however, that the obvious meaning of the several Propositions is that attached to them by the anti-Rosminians; and this appears to be almost, if not quite, admitted by Mr. Morando. The arguments in support of the Rosminian doctrines are all ingenious, and, in certain instances, go far to create the belief that Rosmini did not intend his teaching to depart in essence from that of the accepted Catholic philosophers and theologians. One thing is quite apparent, and it is that Mr. Morando was convinced that the Propositions are not self-evidently in accord with what is commonly regarded as Orthodox, either in philosophy or in theology.

As in the Apology, so in the Critique, the author's method is apt to disclose mistrust of the opponents of Rosmini the man, the philosopher and the theologian. As a specimen of book-making, *i. e.*, printing, etc., the volume is remarkably attractive.

W. R. C.

THE CRUX OF PASTORAL MEDICINE. *The Perils of Embryonic Man: Abortion, Craniotomy and the Cesarean Section.* By *Rev. Andrew Klarman*. 12mo., pp. 162. New York: Pustet & Co.

There is no more burning question at the present time than the one which has called forth this book. The future of society, the future of the nation depend on the right understanding and the faithful observance of God's holy fundamental laws on the relations of the sexes and the generation of the human race. No nation can prosper that violates these laws, and the individuals that compose it bring upon themselves misery here and hereafter. The warnings against race suicide are becoming louder every day, and laws that prevent it in its more flagrant forms are being more strictly enforced in all well regulated communities, but something more is needed to stay the blighting evil. The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, and the further we get away from that wholesome fear the nearer we draw to the precipice.

Our greatest hope for the correction of this evil lies with the doctors. We abstract of course from spiritual aid, and consider the physician not only as a healer of the body, but as a teacher of right ethics. If we can get our physicians to understand the enormous responsibility that rests on them in shaping the morals of their patients while treating their bodies we shall have made long strides forward in this battle with sin in its worst form.

The author of the "Crux of Pastoral Medicine" had this truth before him when he prepared his work. He outlined his purpose clearly as indicated by his sub-title, "The Perils of Embryonic Man," and he never departed from it, as is shown by the heads of his chapters, which are only ten in number.

The work is brief and to the point, and it deals with very important questions in a clear, straightforward manner. What is still better, it answers those questions. We have frequently heard conscientious physicians and medical students inquire for some brief work of this kind, and we hope that the present work will find its way into their hands.

CERTAINTY IN RELIGION. *Rev. Henry Wyman, Paulist.* 16mo., pp. 119. Paper, 10 cents; cloth, 50 cents. In paper, \$5.00 a hundred. New York: The Columbian Press, 120 West Sixtieth street.

We look upon the multiplication of these manuals, explaining Catholic truth, as a sowing of the seed in ever broadening fields. We have Gospel warrant for scattering it abundantly, even though we foresee that much of it will fall by the roadside and be trampled down, or on rocky ground, where it will die for want of moisture, or among thorns, which will choke it. We have the consolation of knowing that some of it has already borne fruit a hundredfold, and looking out into the future, we can see the ripe harvests now awaiting the reaper.

Too much credit cannot be given the Paulists for their untiring labors in this field. They have been working from early in the morning, and their courageous untiring example has been a spur to those who have entered the vineyard, in obedience to the Master's call, later in the day. In the book before us Father Wyman states his purpose thus:

"In the following pages I have endeavored to give my strongest reasons for believing in the Catholic religion, and I hope that my non-Catholic readers will not be less inclined to weigh my arguments because I claim that certainty is attainable in religion."

The author treats of "First Principles," "The Higher Knowledge," "The Primitive Revelation," "The Inspired Word," "Prophecies and

Their Fulfilment," "The Divinity of Christ" and then glances at the history of the Church from the beginning down to the present time.

The book has a tone of dignity about it not common to such unpretentious volumes, and it will appeal most strongly to persons of education.

SYNOPSIS THEOLOGIAE MORALIS ET PASTORALIS. Ad mentem S. Thomae et S. Alphonsi, Hodiernis Moribus accomodata. Tomus Secundus: Theologia Moralis Fundamentalis. Auctore Ad. Tanquery. 8vo., pp. 339. Tomaci (Belg.) Typis Societatis Sancti Joannis Evang.

Father Tanquery's work on Moral and Pastoral Theology is drawing to a close. The present volume, which we have received from Benziger Brothers, is the third to appear, and only one more volume is to come. The present book, which is the third in order of publication, but the second in order of matter, treats of the Fundamentals: "The End of Man," "The Foundation of Morality," "Human Acts," "Laws," "Conscience," "Sins and Vices" and "Virtues in General." The remaining volume will treat of virtues in particular and the precepts of God and the Church. It is now in press and will appear in the fall.

Without going into particulars, we repeat what we have said before on more than one occasion, that this manual is truly practical and exceptionally adapted to our conditions. It should enable the young priest to apply the principles of moral theology which he has learned in the seminary to the particular cases which he meets on the mission with conservatism, toleration and common sense. It should prevent him from making many blunders, painful to the penitent if not unjust, and humiliating to himself. It should teach him at once what many others with less practical books before them have learned only after years of experience.

MISSALE ROMANUM, ex Decreto Sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini Restitutum. S. Pii V. Pontificis Maximi iussu editum. Clementis VIII., Urbani VIII., et Leonis XIII. auctoritate recognitum. Editio Quinta post aeternam uti Typicam a S. R. C. Declaratam. Cum approbatione Sac. Rituum Congregationis. 8vo. Neo Eboraci: Sumptibus et Typis Frederici Pustet. MDCCCXCV.

This is a rare example of skillful book making. Most combination articles are failures, because whereas they are made to serve two purposes, they generally serve neither. We do not know if the publishers of this book intended it to be a hand missal and an altar missal, for we have not seen their advertisement, but it serves both purposes admirably.

It is compact, light in weight, convenient in form, and so well bound that it will lie flat open on the hand or on a missal stand, even at the First Sunday of Advent. The paper is tinted and thin without being transparent. The type is large and clear and the impressions are unusually even. The illustrations, head and tail pieces and ornamental initial letters are artistic in the best sense of the word. It is literally up to date, having the latest Masses in their proper places. It will be exceptionally useful to those who say Mass at stations and have to carry a missionary outfit with them. We very seldom receive a book which we can praise without reservation. This book is the exception.

THE TRAGEDY OF FOTHERINGAY. Founded on the journal of D. Bourgoing, physician to Mary Queen of Scots and on other unpublished documents. By the *Hon. Mrs. Maxwell Scott*, of Abbotsford. New edition. Edinburgh: Sands & Co. Received from Herder. Price, \$1.10, net.

It would have been a barren triumph for the fiends who thirsted for the blood of Mary Stuart if they compassed her death without blackening her character. It was essential to their nefarious plan that she should go down in history as, from birth to death, a thoroughly disreputable woman, who had forfeited her throne through unbridled lust, which had prompted her to the murder of her husband, and who rewarded the generous hospitality granted her by her cousin, the Virgin Queen, by repeated attempts to assassinate her. With the exception of the stolid mob of British Protestants, it is to be doubted whether any one ever seriously believed these charges; but the process of historical vindication is proverbially a slow one. The pathetic narrative before us, compiled by Mrs. Scott from contemporary, and mostly unpublished, documents, of the last days and execution of Mary, brings out in relief what everybody felt in his heart to be true, that Mary died a martyr for her Catholic faith. Her blood was needed to seal and secure the ineffable blessings of the Protestant Reformation.

SCHOOL CIVICS. By *Frank David Boynton*, Superintendent of Schools, Ithaca, N. Y. 12mo., cloth, 368+xii. pages. List price, \$1.00; mailing price, \$1.10.

This book has been written in response to the widely voiced demand of civics teachers throughout the country for a text-book that is something more than a mere catalogue of existing political facts. While maintaining the strictest historical accuracy and the most painstaking exactness in the description of existing institu-

tions, it has been the primary aim of the author to bring this body of fact into vital relation with the experience of those for whom it was written.

The book is a simple, straightforward story of the origin and development of government in general and of our own government in particular, told in language easily comprehensible to pupils of grammar school and high school age. But it is much more than an historical account of the mere form of our government. It sees always the vital principle animating the form, and presents not only the theory of our political institutions, but also their actual working; not merely our written Constitution, but those great and vital unwritten principles as well. In this respect the book is unique among secondary school texts.

A SHORT HISTORY OF ANCIENT EGYPT. By *Percy E. Newberry* and *John Garstang*. One volume, cloth, 12mo. Net, \$1.20, postage extra.

This is a brief history of ancient Egypt from the founding of the monarchy until the disintegration of the empire three thousand years afterward. The progress made by modern research furnishes, in the opinion of the authors, sufficient authority for setting aside the traditions of later historians, and for accepting instead, as the ground for the opinions they have expressed, the evidence of the monuments. It has been their aim to make no statement which does not rest upon the substantial basis of fact. The work is both scholarly and popular, and is written in a style as noteworthy for charm as for dignity and exactness. The joint authors are experienced students of Egyptian archæology, and the book is the ripest fruit of their extensive explorations. This brief handbook offers the general reader an unusual opportunity of obtaining the results of the very latest scholarship in attractive form.

FROM GINN & CO., OF BOSTON AND NEW YORK, we have received the following publications, gotten up in the best form as to type, illustration, paper and binding:

CYR'S GRADED ART READERS. Book II. By *Ellen M. Cyr*, author of the *Cyr Readers*. 12mo., cloth, 136 pages. Illustrated. List price, 35 cents.

To write a simple story based on the masterpiece of some famous painter, that will ring true to the young reader, and at the same time avoid belittling the painting and the artist, is obviously a delicate and difficult task. Miss Cyr is probably one of the very few children's authors capable of accomplishing this work with unques-

tioned skill and good taste. At any rate, Book One of her "Graded Art Readers" (known as Cyr's "Advanced First Reader") is the only noteworthy and successful attempt at this kind of composition.

In text, in illustrations and in its aim to help children appreciate what is beautiful in famous paintings, this second book of the series is a continuation of the work begun in the first volume. As in the earlier book, reproductions of masterpieces form the basis of the text, which consists of simple stories closely allied to the pictures.

LITTLE FOLKS OF MANY LANDS. By *Lulu Maude Chance*, Teacher in the First Grade, Public School, Riverside, Cal. 12mo., cloth, 112 pages. Illustrated. List price, 45 cents.

Chance's "Little Folks of Many Lands" is, within the limits of its subject, the highest type of supplementary reader. It is probable, in fact, that no other geographical reader since the Jane Andrews books has made so favorable an impression upon teachers, critics and readers who have examined the book. In particular, the author has aimed through her book to make the child familiar with the customs, manners and surroundings of the children of several race types. In an imaginary journey around the world the pupil visits many foreign children—the Eskimos, the Indians, the Dutch, the Africans, the Arabians, the Filipinos and the Japanese. He sees the little strangers at their games and sports and learns of their hearthstone stories and folklore tales.

TRACTATUS DE DEO CREATORE ET DE ANGELIS. *Auctore Laurentio Janssens, S. T. D.* Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. Price, \$4.25, net.

This forms the sixth volume of the learned Benedictine's "Summa Theologica," a free commentary on the masterpiece of the Angelic Doctor. Like the preceding tomes, it is distinguished for vastness of erudition, a complete mastery of the ancient and modern literature on the subjects treated of and a firm grasp of the import and bearings of the revealed truths exposed and elucidated. It is just such a work as we may fancy the great Aquinas would produce were he living in our day. This is eminently true of the present volume; for, notwithstanding all the vagaries of the human mind during the past few centuries on the subject of the created universe, there is scarcely any error which was not already amply confuted by the Angel of the Schools. We can heartily recommend this treatise of Janssens to all those who wish to have at hand a triumphant refutation of the innumerable isms of the age.

THE MEANING OF THE IDYLLS OF THE KING. An Essay in Interpretation. By *Conde Benoit Pallen, LL. D.* 16mo., pp. 115. New York: American Book Company.

No higher commendation of this book can be given than the letter which the author received from Tennyson on the publication of a brief magazine article on the subject in 1885:

Aldworth, Haslemere, Surry, April 4, 1885.

Sir: I thank you for your critique on the "Idylls of the King." You see further into their meaning than most of my commentators have done.

Yours faithfully,

TENNYSON.

Mr. Conde B. Pallen, New York city, U. S. A.

The present essay is a still further amplification of the original conception, to which is added an appendix of notes elucidating some points passed over in the text.

COMPENDIUM THEOLOGIAE MORALIS. *Beatae Mariae Virginis Dicitum.* Auctore *Fr. Josepho Colasanto*, Card. Vives, O. M. Cap. Editio VIII. 12mo., pp. 670. Neo-Eboraci: Fredericus Pustet.

It seems superfluous to recommend so well-known a book as the one before us, or to do more than to say that the eighth edition has appeared and that it is a model of the bookmaker's art. The size of the volume, the paper, the type—all prepossess one in its favor before he considers the subject matter. But its excellencies do not stop there; it is a model compendium as well as a model book. It possesses the three qualities essential to a work of the kind and often found wanting in whole or in part—clearness, comprehensiveness and accuracy. It ought to fulfil the author's purpose, which was to make a compendium of all moral theology sufficiently brief to enable the priest to review the whole field at least once a year.

SEVEN LAMPS FOR THE TEACHER'S WAY. By *Frank A Hill, Litt. D.* 12mo., pp. 34.

For forty years Dr. Frank A. Hill gave himself to the cause of public education and by his lectures brought inspiration and encouragement to hundreds of teachers. Of all his addresses the one entitled "Seven Lamps" has met with the widest appreciation. For the benefit of those who wish to preserve it we have recently published it in book form.

THE JONES READERS BY GRADES. By *L. H. Jones, A. M.*, in Eight Books. 12mo. Illustrated.

This series is intended to cover the eight grades of the elementary schools. Each book of the series is adapted to its place and part

in such a plan. The subject matter has been carefully chosen from all fields of knowledge desirable for children of the age for which it is intended. Nature study in all its branches holds a prominent place. The elements of ethics as applied concretely to conduct are taught. The illustrations are apt and beautiful, especially the colored pictures, which are masterpieces of the printer's art.

EARTH AND SKY. Number 3. By *J. H. Stickney*. 12mo., pp. 160.

In the preparation of this third number of "Earth and Sky" the author has endeavored to preserve the unity of the series and also to keep pace with the growing intelligence of its readers. The object has been to call attention to the panorama of nature in such a way as to make natural occasion for oral teaching. In the present number the forces of the material universe are called to mind, beginning with the life forces in plants and animals.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

"**LES SAINTS:**" Saint Columban (vers. 540-615), par l'Abbe Eug. Martin, pp. vi., 198. Saint Francis de Borgia (1510-1572), par Pierre Suau, pp. v., 204. Lecoivre, 90 Rue Bonaparte, 1905.

SAINTS AND FESTIVALS OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. By *H. Pomeroy Brewster*, author of "The Cross in Iconography," etc. 8vo., pp. 558. Illustrated. New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company.

THE STORY OF THE CONGO FREE STATE. Social, Political and Economic Aspects of the Belgian System of Government in Central Africa. By *Henry Wellington Wack, F. R. G. S.* (member of New York Bar). 8vo., pp. xv., 634. With 125 illustrations and maps. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

THE SANCTUARY OF THE FAITHFUL SOUL. By the *Ven. Ludovicus Blossius, O. S. B.* (Louis de Blois), Abbot of Liessies. Translated from the Latin by the late Father Bertrand A. Wilberforce, O. P. B. Herder, St. Louis, Mo. Price, 75 cents, net.

A SPIRITUAL CONSOLATION and Other Treatises. By the Blessed Martyr *John Fisher*, Bishop of Rochester. Edited by D. O'Connor. B. Herder, St. Louis, Mo. Price, 30 cents, net.

IN THE MORNING OF LIFE. Considerations and Meditations for Boys. By *Herbert Lucas, S. J.* B. Herder, St. Louis, Mo. Price, \$1.00, net.

THE ANGEL OF SYON. The Life and Martyrdom of Blessed Richard Reynolds, Bridgettine Monk of Syon, Martyred at Tyburn, May, 1535. By *Dom Adam Hamilton, O. S. B.* To which is added a sketch of the history of the Bridgettines of Syon, written by Father Robert Parsons, S. J., about the year 1595. Edited from a manuscript copy at Syon Abbey, Chudleigh. Sands & Co., Edinburgh. Received from Herder. Price, \$1.10, net.

DAS EVANGELIUM DES HEILIGEN JOHANNES uebersetzt und erklart von *Dr. Johannes Evangelist Belsar*, ord. Professor der Theologie an der Universitaet zu Tuebingen. Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. Price, \$2.85, net.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the *QUARTERLY* will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the *REVIEW* not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXX.—OCTOBER, 1905—No. 120.

THE EARLY RELATIONS OF RUSSIA AND JAPAN.

Muller, G. Fr., *Sammlung Russischer Geschichte*, 1732.

Langsdorf, G. H. von, *Bemerkungen auf einer Reise um die Welt in den Jahren 1803 bis 1807*. Frankfurt am Main, 1812.

Krusenstern, A. von, *Voyage Round the World in the years 1803, 1804, 1805 and 1806*. London, 1813.

Golonin, V. A., *Narrative of my Captivity in Japan*, London, 1818.

Golonin, V. A., *Recollections of Japan*. Followed by an account of the voyages of Messrs. Chwostoff and Davidoff. London, 1819.

Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan. Yokohama, 1872.

THE conquest of Kamtchatka, which was carried out between the years 1697 and 1706 by Vladimir Atlassoff, a colonel of Cossacks, extended the Russian Empire to the shores of the Northern Pacific, within a few weeks' sail of Japan, and thus established it in a position where it would inevitably be soon brought into very close relations with the Japanese Government. This advance was not, however, immediately followed by any endeavor to enter into a treaty with the Mikado and the Shogun, or to induce them to abandon the policy of rigorous seclusion from the outer world which had been adopted by their predecessors in the early part of the seventeenth century. The aims of Peter the Great and of his successor, the Empress Catherine I., were limited to the acquisition of a more thorough knowledge of the northern and eastern coasts of Asia and of the western coast of America, as well as of the islands which might be discovered in the North Pacific and in the Arctic Ocean. Several expeditions were therefore dispatched for this purpose in various directions, and the first,

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1905, by P. J. Ryan, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

which was destined for Japan, was that led by Captain Spangberg and Lieutenant Walton, who in 1739, under the reign of the Empress Anna Ivanovna, sailed from the port of Okhotsk, in Siberia, with four small vessels; but the object of these officers was merely to ascertain the difference in longitude between Kamtchatka and Japan, and with the exception of landing at various places for the purpose of obtaining water, when they were invariably courteously received by the inhabitants, they did not seek to hold any communication with the Japanese people.

In the course of the following years Russian merchants frequently visited the Island of Yezo and the Kurile Islands, but no attempt was made to establish diplomatic relations with Japan until the year 1792, towards the end of the reign of the Empress Catherine II., when Kokaku (1780-1817) reigned as Mikado at Kioto and Iyanori (1787-1838) as Shogun at Yedo. There was then residing in Siberia a Japanese merchant named Kodai, who had been wrecked some time previously on one of the Aleutian Islands, and had been brought to Irkutsk, together with his crew. The Empress heard of him and thought that through his means it might be possible to open negotiations with Japan and obtain for Russia a share of the commercial privileges of which the Dutch had for so long enjoyed a monopoly. He was therefore invited to St. Petersburg, where he was treated with great hospitality and shown the splendor of the imperial court, so as to impress him with a high opinion of the power and wealth of Russia. As, however, the Empress could not feel certain that her friendly overtures would be favorably received, she instructed the Governor General of Siberia, General Pihl, to write in his own name to the Emperor of Japan (the title which foreign nations then gave to the Shogun), and to send the letter by an officer of inferior rank. A lieutenant of the imperial navy named Adam Laxmann was selected for this mission. In September, 1792, he sailed from Okhotsk with the Japanese, who were to be restored to their native land, and on October 7 he anchored in the Bay of Nemuro, on the northern coast of the Island of Yezo, where he passed the winter. He was well received by the Ainos, the aboriginal inhabitants of the island, but the Japanese officials watched him closely, and it was not until the month of April that he received permission to sail to Hakodate and to go from thence by land to Matsumai, the capital of the province, where he was to remit the shipwrecked sailors to the Viceroy. There Laxmann was informed by the delegates sent by the Shogun that by entering a Japanese port other than that of Nagasaki the Russians had rendered themselves liable, according to the laws of the State, to perpetual imprisonment, but that as

they were unaware of the existence of these laws, and had, moreover, been sent by their government to bring some Japanese subjects back to their country, an exception to the rule would be made in their case, and they would be allowed to return to Russia. The delegates also stated that Japan had no knowledge of the degree of greatness to which the Russian Empire had attained or of the manners and customs which prevailed there, and that no other answer could be given to the letter from Russia than by receiving the sailors who had been cast away, and on whose account it had been written; any further intercourse was therefore not desired. Laxmann was, however, given a document authorizing one Russian ship at a time to enter the port of Nagasaki for the purpose of trading, but on condition that during its stay no act of divine worship should be performed on board, as the exercise of the Christian religion could not be tolerated in Japan.

The prolonged state of warfare into which Europe was plunged shortly after 1792 as a result of the French Revolution prevented the Russian Government from availing itself of this permission for many years, and it was not until 1803 that the Czar Alexander I. was able to renew the attempt to enter into a treaty of commerce with Japan. To carry out this intention he took advantage of an expedition which was being got ready for a voyage to the far East by the Russian-American Company, an association of merchants formed towards the end of the eighteenth century to trade with the Russian possessions in the Aleutian Islands and in Alaska. Captain Adam Johann von Krusenstern, an officer of the imperial navy, who had served in the English fleet from 1793 to 1799, was given the command of two vessels which had been purchased in London for this undertaking—the *Nadeshda* (The Hope), of 450 tons, and the *Neva*, of 370—and Count Nicolai Petrovich von Rezanoff, one of the imperial chamberlains, was appointed Ambassador to the Court of Japan. He was accompanied by some scientific men, among whom may be specially noted Dr. George Heinrich von Langsdorff, to whom, as well as to Captain von Krusenstern, we owe an interesting account of the voyage; and he also took with him, in the hope of assuring a favorable reception for his mission, some Japanese fishermen who had been wrecked on the Aleutian Islands a few years after the return of Laxmann.

The expedition sailed from Cronstadt on August 7, 1803, and after stopping for some weeks at Copenhagen, Falmouth, Teneriffe and the Island of Sta. Catherina, on the coast of Brazil, it doubled Cape Horn on March 3, 1804, reached Nukahiva on May 6 and cast anchor on July 15 in the harbor of Petropavlovsk, in Kamtchatka. From thence Captain von Krusenstern continued his

journey on September 7 with the *Nadeshda* only, steering towards Japan with the aid of incorrect charts, through a sea at that time almost unknown to Europeans. He sighted the southern point of the Island of Shikoke on the 28th and reached the entrance of the Bay of Nagasaki on October 8.

The approach of the *Nadeshda* as it cruised along the coast had been signaled to Nagasaki by fires lighted on the hills, and as soon as it was brought to, a boat came alongside with two officials, who asked the Japanese on board many questions with regard to the nationality of the vessel, for what purpose it had come and whether it carried any arms. They were shown the permission to visit the port which had been given to Laxmann, of which they took a copy, and asked why it had not been made use of until then. Towards evening two other officials came to point out the spot, about three-quarters of a mile from the land, where the ship might anchor, and a guard of thirty-two boats, bearing flags on which were the arms of the Prince of Fisen, the local Daimio, was stationed at from fifty to a hundred yards round her, forming a circle which no one was allowed to pass, while three others were placed close to the vessel, in readiness to transmit the captain's demands in case he required provisions or interpreters. Late that night two magistrates of superior rank, one of them being the Governor's secretary ("Opper Bunyos," or "great lords" as they were called by the Dutch-speaking Japanese interpreters who accompanied them), came on board with a numerous retinue. They were received with military honors and were presented to the Ambassador in the cabin, where they seated themselves cross-legged on the sofa, while their servants placed lanterns before them as well as a vessel containing hot embers, another holding tobacco and a spittoon. The interpreters knelt in a semi-circle in front of them, and when one of them spoke to the magistrates he threw himself forward on his hands, bending down his head, and ended his communication by drawing in his breath two or three times with a hissing noise, when the Bunyo replied in an extremely low voice hardly audible to the Russians. At this interview the questions which had been asked by the previous visitors were again repeated and the answers taken down in writing; but the new-comers seemed also very anxious to learn how many days had been employed to make the voyage from Kamtchatka, and if the vessel had passed between Corea and Japan, and they seemed much relieved on finding that it had sailed along the eastern coast.

When this interrogatory had lasted for upwards of an hour the magistrates mentioned to von Resanoff that Mynheer Doeff, the "Opperhoofd" or director of the Dutch factory, together with his

secretary, the captains of two Dutch ships then in the harbor and Baron von Pabst, a traveler of the same nationality, asked permission to visit him, and the fact that these gentlemen had been obliged to wait in their boat alongside the ship until it pleased the Japanese officials to admit them is a remarkable specimen of the humiliations to which the Dutch merchants submitted in order to purchase by their subserviency the exclusive right of trading with Japan. Their reception by the Japanese was equally contemptuous, for they had hardly entered the cabin when they were called upon by the interpreters to do homage to the magistrates by the words: "*Mynheer Opperhoofd, compliment voor de Opper Bunyos,*" "Mr. Director, pay your respects to the higher Bunyos," and were obliged to stand bent almost at a right angle, with their arms hanging, until told by the interpreters that the ceremony was ended. On the occasion of a second visit to the Nadeshda, when the treasurer, the secretary of the Governor and a magistrate were present, the "*compliment*" seemed to Heer Doeff to be unduly prolonged, and becoming impatient he asked the interpreter: "*Kan ik wederom opstaan?*" "May I stand up again?" At the end of the same interview Baron von Pabst tried to leave the cabin without being perceived, and thus avoid this degrading custom, of which he highly disapproved, but an interpreter called after him: "*Heh! Mynheer von Pabst, eer je weg gaat moet je de Groote Heeren een compliment maaken.*" "Oh! Mynheer von Pabst, before you go you must salute the great Lords." And he had to come back and perform the ceremony. At this second interview the Japanese officials informed the Ambassador that, according to a very ancient law, all the arms and ammunition on board should be given up to the government, to be held in trust until the departure of the vessel, to which von Resanoff consented, with the exception of the officers' swords and the arms of the seven soldiers who formed his guard of honor. The former of these demands was readily granted, but the latter was so opposed to all the usages of Japan that no answer could be given until instructions had been received from Yedo.

It was only on these two occasions that the Russians were allowed to hold any communication with the Dutch. Even when the two Dutch vessels left for Batavia on November 8 it was only as an exceptional favor that von Resanoff obtained permission to send by them a letter to the Czar; but it had first to be submitted to the Governor of Nagasaki and a copy of it, together with a translation into Dutch, left with him. It was then returned to the Ambassador to be sealed in presence of two of the Governor's secretaries, by whom it was brought back again to the Governor, who handed it to the Dutch captains. These officers were also strictly

forbidden to acknowledge even by a word the greeting of Captain von Krusenstern as their ship passed his, and when he hailed them to wish them a happy voyage they could only reply by waving their speaking trumpets.

The letter from the Czar, which von Resanoff was to present to the Shogun Iyenori, and a copy of which was demanded by the Governor of Nagasaki to send to Yedo, was the subject of considerable discussion. It was written in Russian, Japanese and Manchu, but the Japanese translation had been made by one of the shipwrecked fishermen and the officials declared that they were unable to understand it, as the writing was very bad and the language mostly unintelligible. It had therefore to be explained to the interpreters sentence by sentence with the help of the Dutch language, with which the Russians were only imperfectly acquainted. It stated that the Emperor of Russia thanked the Emperor of Japan for the permission to send a ship to Nagasaki, and informed him that for the advantage of his subjects in Kamtchatka, Alaska, the Aleutian and the Kurile Islands he wished to enter into a treaty of commerce with Japan, which he trusted would also be of great benefit to the Japanese themselves; and he had, therefore, given orders that the Japanese should be received at all times and in every part of his dominions in the most friendly manner. The letter ended by thanking the Shogun for the kindness shown to Lieutenant Laxmann in 1793, and by requesting him to accept some presents which might serve to give an idea of the products of Russian industry. The fact that the Emperor of Russia wrote this letter himself caused the Japanese much surprise, for it is a thing which the sovereign of Japan never does; even the name of their Emperor, they said (by which they probably meant the Mikado), was kept secret during his lifetime, and it was only after the death of the ruler that the people knew who had reigned over them.

During all the time the Russians stayed at Nagasaki the vigilance with which the *Nadeshda* was watched was never relaxed for a moment; and though crowds of sightseers were brought out every day from the town to view the ship, the line of guard boats kept them at a distance, and all communication with the visitors or the shore was forbidden. The Russians could not but feel that they were treated as prisoners, and von Resanoff, who had expected to enjoy a little more liberty than the Dutch merchants, complained bitterly of the restraint to which he was subjected. His health suffered from his prolonged confinement on board ship, and he requested to be allowed to take exercise on shore. He also asked to have the use of a house for the purpose of unpacking and putting

in order the presents he had brought for the Emperor of Japan, as well as a place where the ship could be repaired. The Governor of Nagasaki professed the utmost willingness to comply with these demands, but observed that the laws of Japan forbade any stranger to land without a special permission from the Shogun; nevertheless, on account of the great esteem he had for the Ambassador, he would make an exception in his favor and allow him to have access to a place where he might walk. The spot selected was on the shore of the Bay of Kibashi, not far from where the *Nadeshda* was moored; and there a space not more than twice the length of the ship and about forty paces wide was enclosed on the side next the land with a palisade of bamboos; every plant and blade of grass was torn up, the soil leveled and strewn with sand. A small wooden shed served as a shelter in case of rain, and two guard houses were built close by. The Ambassador on being granted this concession was requested never to take with him more than nine officers, to allow no sailors to land nor to let any one pass the night on shore. It was only on these conditions that he was allowed this trifling amount of liberty.

After the departure of the Dutch ships the *Nadeshda* was towed to the anchorage which they had occupied off the little Island of *Deshima*, where the Dutch factory had been situated since the year 1641, and near a place called *Megasaki*, where, after protracted negotiations, von Resanoff was at last allowed to reside. The slowness of these proceedings caused the Russians much irritation, and Captain von Krusenstern remarks that the Japanese took every step with the utmost circumspection, as if the least error would cost the life even of the persons highest in rank, and that every thought, every question, every word was weighed in the nicest manner and appeared to have some particular aim in view. The Governor of Nagasaki, indeed, tried to account for the delay by alleging the length of time required to communicate with the capital and the impossibility of allowing the Ambassador to land without orders from his superiors, but von Resanoff learned afterwards from the interpreters that the real reason was that the question of holding any communication with the Russians was considered so important that the Shogun could come to no decision on the subject without consulting the Mikado, and that he had sent the latter an embassy to ascertain his views.

It was not until December 17 that von Resanoff, accompanied by ten officers and fifteen other persons, comprising his guard of seven soldiers, took up his abode at *Megasaki*, and he was conveyed there with every demonstration of respect in the state barge of the Prince of Fisen. This splendidly ornamented boat, 120 feet long, was built

in two stories; the outside of the upper one was hung with stuffs of many colors, and that of the lower with lilac silk bearing the Prince's arms. The partitions of the rooms into which it was divided were lacquered and inlaid with the same device in gold, and the floors were covered with rich carpets. Large numbers of soldiers under arms were ranged on a hill close to the landing place, the neighboring fortifications were decorated with flags and hangings and thousands of spectators covered the shore. The Ambassador on alighting from the barge was received by a Japanese guard of honor and several magistrates, who showed him the greatest courtesy. An ample supply of provisions had been sent to the house for his use, the fire was burning and water was boiling in the kitchen, but when he had been installed in his new dwelling and the Japanese officials had left, the doors were locked and bolted and the Russians found that they were in a closely guarded prison.

The building where they were confined stood upon a small promontory advancing into the sea and occupied three sides of a courtyard about fifty paces in length and forty in breadth; it was surrounded by a high bamboo fence, even on the side next the sea, which shut out all view of the neighboring country, though after some time they were allowed the use of a somewhat larger enclosure. The boats of the Prince of Fisen were stationed in front of the gate leading to the sea, and an imperial civil guard, as well as a military guard furnished by the troops of the Prince of Omuru, watched the door leading to the town. These latter soldiers were soon withdrawn by the express command of the Shogun, but it was only after repeated remonstrances that von Resanoff obtained leave to hold unrestrained communication with the members of the expedition who had remained on board the *Nadeshda* and without being obliged each time to inform the Governor of Nagasaki, though it was still necessary on these occasions to give notice to the officers on guard by hoisting a red flag so as to have the inner and outer fastenings of the doors removed. Every evening, too, the Russians were passed in review, to make sure that neither more nor less than the number agreed on were present. On the other hand, provisions of the best quality were furnished gratuitously to the embassy, and all the materials required by Captain von Krusenstern for the repairs of the ship were immediately procured for him, but a special permission from the Governor of the city was requisite to enable the Russians to make any purchase, and this permission was often refused.

After waiting impatiently in his new residence for some months, von Resanoff at last insisted upon obtaining a decisive answer with regard to his reception, or at least on being given the reasons why

it was deferred. He was then informed by the interpreters that the Shogun and the Mikado were not yet agreed on that question; that they were still negotiating with each other; that the Shogun had summoned a council at Yedo to discuss the advisability of establishing commercial relations with Russia, and that this indecision was the cause of the delay. It was not until March 12 that he learned that he would not be allowed to proceed to Yedo, and that an envoy of much higher rank than the Governor of Nagasaki was already on his way to treat with him. On the arrival of this functionary a long discussion ensued through the intermediary of the interpreters with regard to the ceremonial to be observed at the audience. Von Resanoff positively refused to submit to the degrading formalities demanded by the Japanese, and obtained as a special favor to be allowed to salute the envoy of the Shogun and the Governor of Nagasaki in the European fashion; but he had to consent to leave aside his sword, to take off his shoes before entering the hall of audience and to sit on the floor with his feet stretched out sideways, as he could not be allowed the use of a chair.

The first audience took place on April 4. The Ambassador and five of his officers were conveyed in the Prince of Fisen's state barge from their house at Megasaki to the landing place known as "Ochatto," or the "great stairs," where they were received by a guard of honor and brought from thence, accompanied by a long train of magistrates and soldiers, to the Governor's residence, the Ambassador being carried in a litter, while the others were on foot. Under pretext of showing von Resanoff greater honor, the houses at the landing place and in all the streets through which the procession passed were covered with hangings bearing the imperial arms and those of the Prince of Fisen, so that neither the houses nor the people could be seen. After resting for half an hour, during which pipes and tobacco as well as tea were offered to the Russians, von Resanoff and two of his officers were admitted into the presence of the imperial envoy and the Governor of Nagasaki, who questioned him as to the motives for which he had come to Japan and asked why the Emperor of Russia had taken the liberty of writing to the Shogun, since Lieutenant Laxmann had been informed that it was forbidden by the laws and the customs of the country. They also remarked that though permission had been given to send a trading vessel to Nagasaki, it had never been a question of sending an embassy, and they again demanded for what reasons this permission had not been used for so many years.

Another audience took place on the following day, and at this interview, which was very short, the Ambassador was presented with a roll of paper containing the Shogun's reply to the Emperor's

letter, which was translated for him by the Dutch interpreters. It stated that about 150 years previously the Emperors of Japan had put an end to the free intercourse which had existed until then between Japan and other States, and had forbidden their successors to allow their subjects to leave the country. Only the Chinese and the Dutch were allowed permission to trade with Japan, and every attempt on the part of other nations to share in this privilege had been rejected, as it was considered very dangerous to make friends with unknown foreign powers whose strength might be greater than that of the Empire. The Shogun declined, therefore, to accept the presents sent by the Czar, for if they were accepted it would be necessary to send an Ambassador to offer others in return, which would be contrary to the law, while Japan is so poor that nothing of equal value could be sent. Japan, moreover, had no great wants and suffered from no deficiency of anything. The few foreign wares which had become a necessity from habit were abundantly supplied by the Chinese and the Dutch, and the introduction of luxuries was undesirable. A greater extension of commerce would also cause more intercourse between the people and the foreign sailors, which was strictly prohibited. The Shogun gave orders, however, to supply the ship with provisions for two months, and also that a present of 2,000 sacks of salt of thirty pounds each and a hundred sacks of rice of fifty pounds each should be given to the crew and 2,000 bundles of the finest raw silk to the officers. The Ambassador was obliged to accept these presents much against his will, as the Governor of Nagasaki, who had been ordered to give them, could not have taken them back without referring to Yedo, which would have necessitated a further delay of two months.

No reply could be made to this very decided rejection of the friendly advances of the Czar, which was supplemented by a letter from the Governor of Nagasaki, in which he requested that the *Nadeshda* on leaving the port should stand out far to sea, as the coast was extremely dangerous; and that in future any Japanese who might be shipwrecked on the Russian shores should be handed over to the Dutch in Europe to be brought back by them to Japan by way of Batavia.

After a third audience for the purpose of taking leave of the envoy of the Shogun and of the Governor of Nagasaki, von Resanoff and the other members of the Russian embassy, who had requested in vain to be allowed to visit the Dutch factory at Deshima and one of the temples in or near Nagasaki, sailed from that port on the morning of April 18, 1805, and reached Petropavlovsk, in Kamtchatka, on June 5. Captain von Krusenstern then surveyed the coasts of Saghalien and left on October 7 for Cronstadt, which he

reached on August 19, 1806, being thus the first Russian sailor who circumnavigated the globe.

On his arrival in Kamtchatka Count von Resanoff, who was the son-in-law of the merchant Schelikoff, the founder of the Russian-American Company, found letters awaiting him from the company requesting him to pay a visit of inspection to its possessions in the Aleutian Islands and on the coast of America. He therefore deferred his return to St. Petersburg and sailed on June 14 for Alaska, together with two lieutenants of the imperial navy, Nicolai Alexandrowitch Chwostoff and Gavriilo Ivanowitch Davidoff, who were then at Petropavlovsk, and whom a few years previously he had induced to enter the company's service while retaining their rank under the imperial government, as an ukase of the Emperor Paul I. authorized them to do. In the course of this voyage von Resanoff, who was naturally much irritated at the ill success of his mission, seems to have formed the plan of effecting a descent upon Japanese territory in order to make the Shogun understand how great was the power of the Czar and how dangerous it was to incur his hostility, hoping that he might thereby constrain him to enter into commercial relations with Russia. The establishment within recent years of some Japanese factories in the Kurile Islands and in the south of the Island of Saghalien, where Russian settlements, which had been long since broken up, had once existed, furnished the Ambassador with a plausible pretext for this aggression. He resolved, therefore, to destroy these colonies, to expel the Japanese, to take under the protection of Russia the inhabitants of the islands, who are Ainos, like the population of Yezo, and by declaring them Russian subjects resassert the claims of the Czar to these territories.

The first allusion to this project is found in a letter which von Resanoff addressed on August 29, 1805, while at Sitka, to Chwostoff and Davidoff, in which he informed them that on account of the high opinion he had formed of their patriotism and of their talents, he had selected them to lead an important expedition, for which in due time he would give them full instructions. He then sent a report on the subject to the Czar and to the Minister of Commerce, Count Romanzoff, in which he represented the advantages which he hoped to derive from this enterprise and praised the zeal and intrepidity of Lieutenant Chwostoff, whom he had chosen to command it. It is, however, a remarkable fact that at an interview which Chwostoff had had in the beginning of 1804 with the same Minister, he was asked whether in case an expedition were to be undertaken requiring great efforts and a daring spirit, he should like to take part in it, to which he replied that its danger would only render it the more agreeable to him. It is therefore possible that

this raid, which is generally supposed to have been planned by von Resanoff out of revenge for the ill success of his mission, may really have been decided upon by the government of the Czar in 1803, before the Ambassador left St. Petersburg, with the object of terrorizing the Japanese in case they should reject the Russian proposals.

Von Resanoff left Sitka in July, 1806, to carry out his project, with two small vessels commanded by Chwostoff and Davidoff—the *Juno*, of 250 tons, which had been purchased from Captain Wolf, of Bristol, in the State of Rhode Island, who traded with Alaska, and *Awos* ("Perhaps"), built at Sitka. In a few days, however, he changed his mind and decided on returning to St. Petersburg. He then confided his plan to Chwostoff and gave him instructions for carrying it out, requesting him also to make all concerned in it sign a promise to observe the most profound secrecy, and he sent Davidoff to visit the Kurile Islands and Saghalien, where he was to wait until rejoined by Chwostoff. At the last moment, however, von Resanoff would seem to have felt some doubts as to the legality of the expedition, and to have wished to throw the responsibility of it on his subordinates by leaving it to them to execute it or not, at their discretion. On arriving, therefore, at Okhotsk at the end of September, he requested Chwostoff to give him back his instructions for the purpose, as he said, of amending them, and immediately after having returned to the lieutenant the document thus corrected he left Okhotsk on his way to St. Petersburg, so that it was impossible to question him as to the meaning of the modifications which he had introduced, and which were drawn up in the most ambiguous and contradictory terms. They were to the effect that, as the voyage had been delayed, it was too late for Chwostoff to meet Davidoff at Aniwa Bay, where, too, the fishing season was ended, and that he should therefore disregard the instructions he had previously received and return to America to strengthen the garrison of New Archangel. Nevertheless, if the wind allowed him to put into Aniwa Bay he should examine the situation of the Japanese settlements there and endeavor to win over the natives by distributing presents among them. His chief object, indeed, should be to return to America, but he might find means to reconcile with the interests of the company any unforeseen circumstances which might occur upon the voyage, and his talents and experience would tell him how it would be most advisable to obey this last injunction.

Left, therefore, to find out for himself the meaning of these enigmatical instructions and to decide upon his course of action, Lieutenant Chwostoff came to the conclusion that, though von Resanoff might wish to defer the execution of his project, owing

to the season being so far advanced, he was still resolved that it should be carried out, especially since it had been submitted to the Czar and had not been disapproved of. He therefore sailed for Saghalien, from which Davidoff had been driven away by stormy weather, and landed with a small detachment at Kushunkotan, the principal Japanese settlement, without meeting with any opposition. He then plundered and burnt the magazines, loaded his vessel with rice, tobacco and silken stuffs and distributed to the natives what he could not carry away, giving also to the chief of the villages on the western coast of the Bay of Aniwa the silver medal and ribbon of the Order of St. Vladimir as a sign that the Czar had taken possession of the island, and leaving with him a document to that effect. He then sailed for the harbor of Petropavlovsk, where he met Davidoff and where he passed the winter.

In the spring of the following year, while the ice still surrounded the coast, the two officers cut a passage through it for their ships and set out on May 2 for another piratical expedition, which, however, like that of the preceding year, they may perhaps have looked upon as a vindication of the anterior rights of Russia against Japanese aggressiveness. They landed with about 200 men on Iturup, one of the southern Kurile Islands, where two flourishing colonies of Japanese and Ainos engaged in fishing had been established since about ten years. After plundering and burning Naiho, the smaller of the two settlements, they surprised at night the castle of Shana, where the garrison was stationed, and burned it also, after carrying off much booty and arms of various sorts. The destruction of a third Japanese factory in Saghalien and the capture of some junks ended the campaign, but von Resanoff, who could have accepted the responsibility for the expedition and defended his subordinates, had died in the month of March, of a fall from his horse, in the village of Krasnojarsk, on the Yenissei, while on his way to St. Petersburg, and when Chwostoff and Davidoff reached Okhotsk Captain Bucharin, the commandant of the port, threw them into prison as criminals, under the pretext that they had acted without authority, and seized their ships, which he imagined were laden with immense treasures. At the end of a month, during which they were treated with great inhumanity, they found means to escape, and after long and painful wanderings through woods and marshes they reached Yakutsk. There they were again arrested and detained until released by order of the Minister of Marine, which would seem to indicate that whether the project of invading and devastating some territory belonging to Japan had originated with von Resanoff or with the Russian Minister, it had been accepted and approved of by the Czar.

The casualty which shortly after ended the lives of Chwostoff and Davidoff at the very moment when everything seemed to promise them a brilliant future, was so strange and unexpected that it may perhaps be interesting to relate it, though not a matter immediately connected with the subject of this article. On the breaking out in February, 1808, of the war with Sweden which ended by the conquest of Finland, the two lieutenants reëntered the imperial navy and distinguished themselves by their bravery in the course of the campaign, at the close of which, in September, 1809, they returned to St. Petersburg, where they met again Captain Wolf, from whom they had purchased the *Juno*, and Dr. von Langsdorf, with whom they had traveled to Alaska. The young officers were returning home one dark night in October after supping with their friends, who accompanied them as far as the bridge of boats over the Neva and saw them cross it; but for some unknown reason a few minutes later they wished to retrace their steps. The bridge being then open, they tried to jump on to a barge passing through, but they alighted on a sail stretched over its side, and, entangled in its folds, they sank into the river and were swept away by its rapid current.

It is not surprising that these unprovoked attacks should have caused considerable alarm and excited a strong feeling of resentment among the Japanese, and that when in the beginning of July, 1811, Captain Vassili Mikhailovitch Golovnin, who had been sent from Kamtschatka in command of the imperial sloop of war *Diana* to survey the southern Kurile Islands and the coast of Tartary, approached a small fortress at the southern extremity of the Island of Kunashiri, his vessel should have been fired upon. An attempt to land along with a few sailors also drew the fire of the battery upon his boat, but, as he remarks in his "Narrative," the Japanese did not know how to point their guns, and their powder, which made a thick black smoke, was very bad. After a few days, however, Captain Golovnin succeeded in communicating with the Japanese officers and in obtaining supplies of wood and water, while by means of a Kurile interpreter he had with him named Alexei he sought to persuade them that the Russian Government was not responsible for the piratical enterprises of Chwostoff and Davidoff, and had duly punished them for their misdeeds. But, as the interpreter informed him, the approach of the sloop had filled the Japanese with consternation, and the sight of a Russian inspired them with terror, for they had been astonished at the rapidity of the Russian fire and the excellent order in which they had fought in the attack made on their settlements. It was, therefore, probably as a precaution against another surprise, if not as retaliation for the

past, that the Governor of the fort, after inviting Captain Golovnin to a conference and treating him hospitably, suddenly threw off the mask and seized him along with two other officers, four of his sailors and the interpreter.

The prisoners were immediately bound after the Japanese fashion, first with thick cords and then with smaller ones, tied with a combination of loops and knots so cunningly devised that on the slightest attempt to escape they could be drawn still more tightly so as to produce intense pain or even strangulation. Some time later it was explained to the Russians that the object of this rigorous treatment, to which even the most distinguished Japanese officers were subjected when arrested, and even before being proved to be guilty, was to render it impossible for them to commit suicide, which, according to Japanese ideas, they might be driven to do from despair at the misfortune which had befallen them. On the following day Captain Golovnin and his companions were brought over to the Island of Yezo. They traveled in boats along its coast for some days, and then by land, walking or carried in litters, but still tightly bound, till on July 17, in the town of Akeshi, their bonds were removed for a short time and the wounds caused by their pressure were bandaged. Two days later a richly dressed private of the Shogun's guard, whose position gave him a rank superior to that of the retainers of a Daimio, took the command of the escort, which was composed of soldiers belonging to the army of the Prince of Nambu, and ordered the hands of the prisoners to be left unbound. They then continued their journey towards Hakodate, at the southern extremity of the island, which they entered on August 8 with great ceremony, the soldiers of the escort putting on their helmets and coats of mail for the occasion.

With the exception of this cruel system of binding the limbs of their prisoners as one of the precautions against suicide decreed by the laws, which extended even to fixing wooden balls to the mouthpieces of their pipes, lest they should try to swallow them, the conduct of the Japanese towards Captain Golovnin and his companions was uniformly humane and courteous. They were given three meals a day, consisting generally of boiled rice, pickled radishes, broth made of radishes and broiled fish. On arriving at their lodgings in the evening their feet were bathed with warm water, and the crowds which assembled in every village to witness their arrival or their departure never offered them the slightest insult or showed any signs of hatred, but frequently asked to be allowed to give them fruit and other delicacies. The Japanese also took great pleasure in having sketches of ships, or Russian names, or anything in the Russian language inscribed upon their fans by

the prisoners, to be preserved as great curiosities, and never, indeed, at any time did they manifest that antipathy to foreigners which is so characteristic of other Orientals, but seemed as if they would willingly have entertained friendly relations with the outer world if it were not for the jealous prohibition of their rulers.

On reaching Hakodate the Russians were brought to a large gloomy building resembling a barn, surrounded by a fence crowned with a *cheval-de-frize*, outside which ran a low wall of earth hung with striped cloth. Within it was divided into several apartments about six feet square and eight feet high formed of strong spars and resembling bird cages. That in which Captain Golovnin was confined had two windows closed with gratings, one of which commanded a view of the Straits of Tsugar and of the neighboring hills; but those in which his companions were placed were smaller and almost without light. The only furniture was a bench and a few mats and cushions. Before long, however, these cages were enlarged by the suppression of the partitions, and the Russians were allowed to converse together. They were visited every day by officers of the Governor of Hakodate, accompanied by a physician named Togo, and they were frequently brought before the Governor to be examined by him. At these interviews they were very minutely questioned as to their names and ages, the places of their birth, their rank in the navy, how many men they commanded and the number of guns on board their ship. A very singular question was suggested by the change in the mode of dressing the hair which had taken place since some years, for Laxmann had worn his hair powdered and tied in a long pig-tail, while Captain Golovnin and his companions wore theirs unpowdered and cut short. The Governor, therefore, asked if there had not been a change of religion in Russia, and was much surprised to learn that in Europe there was no connection between religion and the fashion in which the hair was worn, nor any law on the subject. The answers to all these questions were carefully written down, the greatest precision in the translation was insisted on, and as the Kurile interpreter was not very well acquainted with either Russian or Japanese the examination generally lasted for several hours.

The anxiety of the Russians as to the fate which might be awarded them may well be imagined, for they knew that the law of Japan condemned whoever landed on the shores of the Empire to imprisonment for life, and by the questions put to them they perceived that they were suspected of having participated in the piratical expeditions of Chwostoff and Davidoff. To whatever was asked on that matter Captain Golovnin, who was most probably not aware that a report on the subject had been sent to the Czar, could only

reply that those officers had acted without authorization; that they commanded mercantile vessels, and that their crews were not in the service of the State. Moreover, on returning to Okhotsk they had been thrown into prison and their ships had been seized by the commandant of the port.

The Japanese officials, it is true, did not seem to be fully convinced by these answers, and the Russians were much alarmed and embarrassed on being shown the paper which Chwostoff had given to the chief of Aniwa Bay, in which he took the title of lieutenant of the Russian fleet and commander of the frigate *Juno*.

This compromising document rendered it still more difficult for Captain Golovnin to persuade the Governor that the *Juno* was really a merchant vessel, and that Chwostoff had acted on his own responsibility, but he does not fail to remark in his "Narrative" that the Japanese always questioned him with the greatest courtesy, laughing good humoredly and seeking to make the examination resemble a conversation between friends rather than a formal inquiry.

At the end of September the Russians were transferred to Matsumai, the capital of the island, where their prison, like that of Hakodate, consisted of two cages. That in which the officers were placed was six paces square and ten feet high; the other, where were the four sailors and Alexei, the interpreter, was of equal breadth and height, but two paces longer. Outside was a guard room, where two soldiers of the Shogun's army were always on duty, and beyond the fence which surrounded the building was an outer guard furnished by the soldiers of the Prince of Tsugar.

At Matsumai the Bunyo or Viceroy of the Island of Yezo, whose jurisdiction extended also over the Kurile Islands and Saghalien, examined the Russians frequently, and his questions were still more incoherent and irrelevant than those asked at Hakodate. Such inquiries as "What kind of dress does the Emperor of Russia wear?" "What kinds of birds are found near St. Petersburg?" "How many guns are placed round the imperial palace?" "In what way do the Russians eat their food?" "What are the dimensions of the imperial palace, and what is the number of its windows?"—to quote only a few from the long list given in the "Narrative"—irritated the Russians, who were anxious to obtain their liberty with as little delay as possible, and they often refused to reply. The Bunyo, who was invariably extremely courteous towards his prisoners, would then apologize and protest that he merely questioned them as a friend, and these scenes sometimes recurred three or four times in the course of the same interview.

As the winter approached the Japanese sought to alleviate as

much as possible the hardships of prison life for Captain Golovnin and his companions. They provided them with warm clothing and furs, gave them benches to sleep on and built fireplaces close to each cage, in which they kept up charcoal fires both day and night. Towards the end of December, by the removal of the bars which separated each cell, their prison was changed into a large hall, the floor of which was covered with mats, and in March they were allowed to walk about the town and its environs accompanied by some soldiers, an interpreter and servants, who carried their dinner. In April they were at last removed from the prison to a large and comfortable house provided with a garden, but where they were still closely guarded by the soldiers of the Shogun and of the Prince of Tsugar. Here they found themselves in more favorable circumstances for executing the project they had long entertained of attempting to escape; for they were exasperated at the slowness with which the deliberations regarding their fate were carried on at the court of the Shogun and the uncertainty of the result. At Yedo, indeed, as they were informed, there was a general conviction, even among the people, that Lieutenant Chwostoff had made his descent on the Japanese settlements by order of the Czar, and that Captain Golovnin had come to inspect their harbors as the forerunner of a still more formidable expedition. Despairing, therefore, of being ever set free, the Russians decided that they would prefer to perish in attempting to escape rather than remain in Japan, and they discussed the possibility of surprising and disarming their guards at night, when they would make for the sea-shore, where they hoped to seize some vessel in which they could gain the coast of Kamtchatka or of Tartary. They began, therefore, to make preparations for their flight. They laid by every day a portion of their rice; they concealed a chisel and a spade which had been forgotten in their garden; they procured tinder by burning some linen, and to make a compass they magnetized a needle by rubbing it on a stone, and made a case for it out of a few sheets of paper fastened together with rice. The watchfulness of their guards was not the only danger against which they had to take precautions, but also, strange to say, the hostility of one of their number, the midshipman Moore, who was, indeed, born in Russia, but who, as his father was German, sought to dissociate himself from his comrades and threatened to denounce their plans to the Japanese, in whose service he hoped to enter as European interpreter.

Captain Golovnin and his companions, with the exception of Moore and the interpreter Alexei, were at last able to execute their project at midnight on April 23, after their guards had performed

their usual round of inspection. A hole was then quickly dug under the fence surrounding the house; they crept through it, and after crossing a neighboring cemetery and some open fields they climbed the hills lying to the north of the town, a journey of three days through which, according to their calculations, would bring them to the western coast of the island. For several days they made their way through the mountains, which in many places were still covered with snow, traveling usually only at night and hiding by day in the woods, where they were able to light a fire and cook their provisions. They frequently approached the shore, along which lay numerous villages, but some of the boats they found there were too small, while others had been dragged so high on the beach that they were unable to launch them. After undergoing very great hardships in the course of their wanderings, they were surrounded on May 2 by soldiers, who had followed their traces, and brought back to Matsumai with their hands tied behind them, but not so cruelly as on the previous occasion, and neither their guards nor the crowds which assembled to look at them as they passed through the villages offered them any insult or treated them with derision, but seemed rather to commiserate their misfortune.

On their return to Matsumai the Bunyo received them with his usual courtesy and without expressing any anger or displeasure he questioned them as to the motives of their flight and showed them how hopeless had been their attempt; but he assured them that as they were foreigners and therefore ignorant of the laws of the country, his good opinion of them would remain unaltered. They were then led to one of the ordinary prisons for criminals, where the cages were somewhat smaller than those in which they had been first confined; but it was, nevertheless, as Captain Golovnin remarks, much superior to most European prisons of that epoch, for it was scrupulously clean and was swept out every day. The Russians remained here till the beginning of July, when they were transferred to the place in which they had been first confined on their arrival in Matsumai; and as they were now allowed the use of writing materials they began to compose a Japanese vocabulary, but they were obliged to use Russian characters, for the laws of Japan did not allow Christians to be taught to read or to write the language, and Kumadschero, the Bunyo's interpreter, could not obtain permission to teach them the Japanese alphabet.

In the meantime every effort was being made to rescue the prisoners which was possible in such a remote locality and under the difficult circumstances in which the Russian Government was at that time situated. The news of the seizure of Captain Golovnin had been brought to Okhotsk by Lieutenant Rikord, who had suc-

ceeded to the command of the sloop *Diana*, and who, after exchanging some shots with the Japanese batteries, soon perceived that it would be useless to attempt to storm the castle with the small force of fifty-one officers and men at his disposal. The lieutenant forwarded his report to St. Petersburg, together with a request that an expedition might be fitted out for the purpose of delivering the prisoners, but the Russian Empire was at that moment at war with Turkey, and was drifting into the war with France which had as its result the invasion of Russia, and the Emperor Alexander could only direct Lieutenant Rikord to return to Kunashiri and ascertain the fate of the imprisoned Russians.

The lieutenant set sail on July 22, 1812, and did not arrive at Kunashiri till August 28. He had with him six Japanese who had been wrecked on the coast of Kamtchatka in the previous year and one of those who had been carried off by Chwostoff and who could serve as interpreter. At Kunashiri Lieutenant Rikord tried to communicate with the commandant of the fort, but after waiting several days the only reply he received to his letters was a verbal message from that officer that he might hold an interview with him in the town, an invitation which it would have been imprudent to accept, and when the interpreter was sent on shore to inquire what had become of Captain Golovnin and his companions, the answer he brought back was "they are all dead." Anxious, however, to obtain more certain information, Lieutenant Rikord a few days later captured a large Japanese ship which was commanded by its owner, a wealthy merchant named Tachatai Kachi. From him he learned that the prisoners were then living at Matsumai, and hoping that through his intervention he might acquire some knowledge of the views of the Japanese Government towards them, he brought him away to Kamtchatka, together with four of his sailors. The kind treatment which Tachatai Kachi experienced during his stay at Petropavlovsk, where he soon learned to converse in Russian, made a favorable impression on him, and he expressed a desire to see the differences between the two Empires speedily adjusted; he also stated that when von Resanoff's mission came to Nagasaki the Japanese had hoped that a commercial treaty would be concluded with Russia, and that they were displeased with their government when it dismissed the Ambassador without granting him an interview.

Lieutenant Rikord returned to Kunashiri with Tachatai Kachi in the month of June following. An imprudent threat on his part that in case he received no information about his countrymen within three days he would bring his prisoner back to Okhotsk and return with armed vessels to demand their liberation nearly drove the

Japanese merchant to commit suicide. He had already made preparations for it by cutting from the crown of his head the central tuft of hair, which he placed in a box together with his portrait and gave to one of the sailors to be brought to his wife, as well as his sword to be presented to his son, as a sign that he died an honorable death, and his family would then have buried his hair with all the ceremonies observed at an interment. A timely change in Lieutenant Rikord's plans luckily saved Tachatai's life; but he very frankly confessed that before killing himself he would have killed the lieutenant and his first officer, a deed which would have caused his memory to be cherished with respect and conferred great honor on his descendants.

Tachatai was therefore allowed to land for the purpose of negotiating with the commander of the fortress, and after a few days Takahassi Sampei, the first counsellor of the Viceroy of Yezo, arrived from Matsumai in a ship decorated with flags and bearing on her sails the red disk which was the imperial emblem. He brought a request from the Japanese Government to be furnished with an attestation signed by two Russian commanders of districts that Chwostoff had made his piratical descents on the Kurile Islands and Saghalien without the knowledge and consent of the Russian Government, and also that the arms which had been carried off might be restored, or at least an assurance given that they were no longer to be found in Okhotsk.

Lieutenant Rikord sailed immediately for the Siberian port and returned from it to Hakodate on September 27, bringing the document demanded by the Japanese Government with the signatures of the Governor of Irkutsk and of the commander of Okhotsk. During his stay in the harbor of Hakodate, while waiting for an answer, the laws which prohibited any intercourse with Europeans were rigorously enforced. The Russians were forbidden to sail about the harbor; a guard boat was stationed near their ship by night and by day, and though the government furnished them with all they needed, no one, with the exception of Tachatai and some officers, was allowed to visit them until the day of their departure. As a curious example of the usages of old Japan, it may be mentioned that Tachatai Kachi on returning to his country learned that his wife, overcome with grief at his capture, had undertaken a pilgrimage to the most celebrated shrines of Japan, and that for the same reason one of his friends had distributed all his wealth to the poor and retired to the mountains to live as a hermit.

The letter from the Governor of Irkutsk was presented to the officers sent by the Viceroy of Matsumai in a solemn audience, to which Lieutenant Rikord was conveyed in the Governor's state

barge, accompanied as a special favor by ten marines under arms, and he was soon after allowed to have an interview with Captain Golovnin and the other prisoners. The translation of the Russian documents into Japanese and the preparation of the answers occupied some days, but on October 7 Captain Golovnin and his companions were at length set free after a detention of two years and three months, and on the 10th the *Diana* sailed for Petropavlovsk, which she reached on November 3, 1813.

It may perhaps be interesting to conclude this article by quoting the opinion of the Japanese which Captain Golovnin, who studied them attentively, has expressed in his "Recollections of Japan," and his forecast of the degree of power to which they might attain if they were ever constrained to revoke the laws which isolated them from the world and to adopt European institutions :

"The Japanese Government will have the people satisfied with the degree of knowledge they possess and to make use of the productions of their own country, and forbids them to adopt anything foreign, lest foreign manners should creep in with foreign arts and sciences. Their neighbors must thank Providence for having inspired the Japanese law-givers with this thought, and should endeavor to give them no inducement to change this policy for that of Europe. What must we expect if this numerous, ingenious and industrious people, who are capable of everything and much inclined to imitate all that is foreign, should ever have a sovereign like our Peter the Great? With the resources and treasures which Japan possesses he would enable it to become in a few years the ruler of the Eastern Ocean. What would then become of the maritime provinces of Eastern Asia and the settlements on the west coast of America, which are so remote from the countries by which they must be protected? If the Japanese should think fit to introduce the science of Europe, and adopt our policy as a model, we should then see the Chinese obliged to do the same ; in that case these two powerful nations might soon transform the state of Europe. However deeply a horror of everything foreign may be impressed on the Japanese and Chinese Governments, yet a change in their system is not inconceivable ; necessity may compel them to do that to which their own free will does not impel them. Attacks, for example, like that of Chwostoff often repeated would probably induce them to think of means to repel a handful of vagabonds who disturbed a nation. This might lead them to build ships of war on the model of those of Europe ; these ships might increase to fleets, and then it is probable that the success of the measure would lead them to adopt the other scientific methods which are applicable to the destruction of the human race. In

this manner all the inventions of Europe might gradually take root in Japan, even without the creative spirit of a Peter, merely by the power and concurrence of circumstances. The Japanese certainly would not be in want of teachers if they would only invite them. I therefore believe that this just and upright people must by no means be provoked."

DONAT SAMPSON.

London, Eng.

THE RELIGIOUS ELEMENT IN THE MEDIÆVAL GUILDS.

IT HAS been said by a keen, scholarly critic that the cheerful optimism of the American people often blinds them to social evils that day by day wax strong under the very eyes of statesmen and legislators, much to the danger of our national peace and security. That this contains at least a measure of truth was well proved on the occasion of our last national elections. Statistics of votes revealed to many an incredulous eye the startling fact that socialism, a sure sign of unrest and discontent, had suddenly, as if by magic, become a power in politics. A great many of our citizens blinked their eyes and caught their breath and for a while refused to be convinced. But facts are stubborn and will in the event displace sentiment and make room for a fairer play of reason. So at least it happened in the present case, and then forthwith "dire portent and prophecy" went abroad. Our conservative fathers shook their venerable heads in token of serious misgivings, whilst the young in their own thoughtless way wondered whither away the nation. And yet had these men taken more serious thought on our social conditions, no optimism, cheerful or otherwise, would have closed their eyes to the real state of affairs. Dense, widespread smoke argues an extensive fire. Frequent lawless disturbances bespeak deeper and more serious social ills. For years past there have swept over the country periodic waves of violence that was regardless of human life, defiant of law and authority and destructive of trade. For instance, in 1886 strikes and lockouts, violent and mild, totaled 9,861; thereafter they wavered like uncertain fever curves, until at last, in 1890, they jumped to the maximum again and seriously menaced public security. In many respects the aspect of still later days is a bit more gloomy. An able summary in a recent issue of the

*Catholic Fortnightly Review*¹ so presents the situation that even "he who runs may read:" "For two years and a half . . . deaths from violence incident to strikes were four-fifths as many as in the two days' fighting at El Caney and San Juan, while the injuries were actually one-third more numerous. There were in all 180 deaths, 1,651 injuries and 5,533 arrests. . . . A further analysis establishes the fact, which hardly needs statistical proof, that the deaths and injuries are chiefly inflicted on non-union men, while most of the arrests are of union strikers. Of the 180 killed 116 were non-union men, 51 union strikers and 13 officers. Of the 1,651 injured 1,366 were non-union men, 151 union strikers and 134 officers. On the other hand, of the 5,333 arrests 5,159, or nearly four-fifths, were of union men. These figures need no comment; they show that at times an evil leaven ferments to excess the susceptible spirit of our workmen. In critical moment, and perhaps in others, too, the trade unions betray a surly, socialistic temper that discredits them in the public mind and undoes much of the good work which they have so laboriously accomplished.

To law makers and economists this is no doubt annoying; to us it should prove interesting, in that it furnishes occasion for a study of other workmen, and especially of other unions which were so deeply permeated with a religious spirit that they proved an almost universal blessing to employer and employe, to Church and State alike. Such were the guilds of the much maligned Middle Ages, unions in name and fact, with a sublime mission for good to craftsmen and tradesmen of all ages and conditions.

When these societies first came into vogue it is hard to say. Tertullian is witness for the fact that some such unions had place amongst the early Christians. Two centuries later frequent and clear reference is made to a society of goldsmiths, and thereafter there is no obscurity. Dagobert I. in the seventh century issued an edict that concerned a bakers' guild; the first holy Roman Empire boasted its corporations of artisans; the annals of Ravenna witness a fisherman's union as early as 943 A. D., which brings us to the beginning of the period with which our remarks are chiefly concerned.² In final aim, not, however, in method, these guilds were much the same as our modern union; in structure they differed, in that they included not only the employes, but also the employers. The one and the other lived together under approved rules which, though severe in their Christian simplicity, were insisted on with an exactness that is little short of marvelous. This will surprise us the more when we consider that the observance of

¹ Summarizing from the *Outlook*.

² German craft guilds belong to a somewhat later period.

these regulations called for the practice of an exalted virtue that is almost unknown to-day, even amongst our most upright American workers. Mediæval craft and tradesmen evidently grasped to the full the significance of these words of one of their favorite manuals: "Let us," it reads, "work according to God's laws, else shall our labor be without blessing and bring evil on our souls. Men should work for the honor of God. . . . He who, acting otherwise, seeks only pecuniary recompense of his work, does ill and his labors are but usury."³ Or, again, as it is written elsewhere: "The master must take the apprentice to church and with zeal bring him up in honesty and the fear of God. . . . He (the apprentice) must, morning and evening, during his work, beg God's help and protection, for without God he can do nothing. . . . Every Sunday and holyday he must hear mass and a sermon and read good books. He must be industrious and seek not his own glory, but God's."⁴ Herein was the secret of the guild's power. The sweet spirit of Christ was abroad on the earth, all pervading and deep enough to leaven the hearts of the crudest toiler. Cooks and butchers, brewers and fruit venders, tailors, masons, painters and shoemakers, bakers, dyers, barbers and carpenters, everybody who earned his bread in the sweat of his brow had learned the true lesson of life and was anxious to enroll himself in a guild which would see to it that his stay on earth was sweetened as best it might by virtue and prosperity.

There was no neglect, no inactivity. Over each guild there presided a warden or syndic whose constant care it was to preserve the honor and dignity of his society. Elected by his fellows or appointed as might be by a King or feudal lord, he felt the importance and responsibility of his position. As a consequence, his eye was ever alert for abuses which, as we shall see, were met with most drastic remedies. Day after day he made his tour of inspection to see that no rule, however slight, was disregarded.

But the guild's care of the virtue and fair name of its members did not begin with this precaution. For from the beginning it exercised a most careful vigilance over all candidates. The very first conditions for admission were legitimate birth and a spotless reputation. He who lacked unimpeachable testimony on these scores applied in vain for enrollment. These assured, the young man after due instruction in his duties and obligations, was led to a church or shrine by two sponsors, and there before an altar or favorite statue most solemnly assumed the obligations of his state. Then forthwith, while the

³ Janssen, Vol. II., p. 9.

⁴ Janssen, Vol. II., p. 20.

spell of religion was still fresh upon him, he was inducted with much ceremony into the presence of the Mayor or other official and in turn taken to the house of his master. Here, at one period at least, he found an honorable place amongst the children of the household. This was no mere "boarding out system." Under pain of most severe penalties the master was obliged to look sharp to the spiritual and bodily welfare of his charge. He was to maintain him in comfort and upbringing him in the fear of God and love of work. And woe to him were he caught overtaking the boy's strength or prolonging his hours of labor or setting him a task that prevented his attendance at Mass on days of obligation. As a consequence of all these precautions the master usually proved a sincere, tender foster-father. In accordance with his rule he was watchful of the boy's morals, shielding him by quaint means from love of prowling by night and gambling and excessive drink. Moreover, in his own conduct the master was scrupulously careful to set an example of purity and uprightness that was sure to have effect upon a susceptible heart. He had before his mind this ennobling thought contained in one of the rules of the stone-cutters' guild: "If, according to the Christian dispensation, all are bound to seek the salvation of their souls, how much more so are those masters and workers whom God has graciously endowed with talents. . . . If they possess Christian hearts, they should be filled with gratitude and work for the glory of God and the salvation of their own souls."⁵ Now this was not hollow cant. It was at once a rule of life and an expression of an almost universal conviction which saw fulfillment in daily work. These men of the days of faith were wise with the wisdom of their Father and gave force to their wisdom in the rules of the guilds. In keeping with their precepts they observed faithfully and joyfully fast and feast. Moreover, no consideration of profit or desire of pleasing dissenting neighbors was taken as a justification for "open shop" on a forbidden day. Indeed, in many guilds so strict were the rules about religious duty that play at dice or cards on the eve of those feasts, which were celebrated with special pomp and ceremony, was forbidden under pain of a year's suspension. Games, it was argued, meant late hours and late hours were apt to induce neglect of a sacred duty on the morrow. The consequence of all this can easily be inferred. There were few complaints about empty pews, skipping of sermons and prolonged absence from confession. The guildsman's rules obviated these modern difficulties. No mere whim could keep him from Mass or confession or monthly attendance at the special service in the guild church or chapel. All these

⁵ Janssen, Vol. II., p. 10.

were of precept, and that was sufficient for him. Perhaps the guildsman's religious enthusiasm, so simple and spontaneous ever in those phlegmatic by nature, found its fullest expression on the patronal feast of his society. At an early hour he was at the guild house, where he met his happy, cheery companions who had gathered together from all sides. When all was in readiness off they went to the church, column after column in grand array, catching inspiration from brilliant banners, emblazoned with pictures of their patron saints, who had been chosen for this office because they had sanctified themselves at their trades or crafts and would in turn guide their client guildmen in the way of light and truth. In the church all assisted at a Solemn Mass, and while they were thus engaged within, the poor without were enjoying a substantial dinner at the guild's expense. But perchance this may smack of sentiment. Some skeptic may ask for stronger proof of the religious spirit of these guilds.

If his standard of judgment be: "By their fruits ye shall know them," he will find strong argument in a still broader charity that always characterized these unions. Amongst themselves the members were as brothers, soul knit to soul. A master guildman's home was the whole world. Wherever he went he was welcomed with open arms and a warm heart. Differences of race and language did not interfere with the exercise of tender charity; the traveler was welcomed to the hearth of his fellows, to be cheered by the same joy and peace that obtained at his home in a far distant land. Nor was this fine sense of fellowship reserved for members alone. The needy of every age and condition felt its spell. The saddened lives of widows and orphans were brightened by it. Dowerless maidens had reason to be thankful for it. It reached out to slaves in far-away lands and broke the gyves that fettered body and soul.⁶ It found expression in the establishment of schools for the conversion of pagans and infidels. In France, Spain, England, Germany and Italy it erected and adorned churches and built and maintained hospitals. We read in an ancient chronicle, for example, that at one time France was dotted with exquisite shrines wrought of gold and silver, the generous gift of the guilds. Gothic cathedrals, too, and storied stained-glass windows and delicate screens and marvelous bronze gates all tell the same story of whole-souled charity. But no doubt the sweetness and tenderness of the guild's charity is shown to the best advantage by their care

⁶ Digby, in "Ages of Faith," Vol. I., bk. 2, p. 212, records that in the year 1830 it was stated in London that the ironmongers' fraternity were then in possession of £104,000, and of £3,000 per annum, accumulated in their hands from ancient donations which had been destined for the redemption of Christian slaves on the Barbary coast.

of the sick. Almost every union maintained its own hospital, where the suffering members of Christ's body were nursed with a tenderness and consideration that appealed to every heart. Luther, for instance, during his visit to Rome bore glowing testimony to the perfection of the Italian hospitals, a fact which is the more surprising in view of the circumstance that for years his own land was justly famous for its guild infirmaries and hospitals.⁷

The guilds' consideration for the minor comforts of the poor is well illustrated by the fact that in many places, especially in Germany, they spent large sums of money in the erection of bath houses, which were open to the use of all. Sometimes, it is true, a small fee was exacted for the bath. This, however, was quite exceptional, and in those places in which the custom was in vogue many of the unions had a special fund for bath money, on which every apprentice might draw as he willed. Moreover, guildmen not infrequently left legacies for the foundation of bath houses, wherein wine and biscuit were distributed to the poor after the bath. And we read—how strange it sounds!—that in one city every poor person who bathed on Saturday received a small sum of money, perhaps by way of reward and encouragement. Janssen in his history of the German guilds tells us that at least once a year the guildmen of a certain town were accustomed to don white robes and march to the bath houses to the music of the fife and drum.⁸ This may move a smile; and indeed at first blush it is suggestive of an unseemly prank of college boys whose inflammable enthusiasms have been fired in some mysterious way by an athletic victory over an old rival. However, quaint though this may be, it might teach a salutary lesson sadly needed in our day, when, according to the statement of a trustworthy journal, seventy-five per cent. of the public school children of one of our large Eastern cities are unwashed and fifty per cent. pediculous. All this care of the guilds about bathing does not surprise us when we understand that they considered cleanliness of body an aid to virtue. "Possess your souls in strength and purity, no less preserve your bodies strong and pure; thereto use what precautions your leisure will permit, also bathing and the like. . . . And they must use the money (bath money) well, for every laborer, whatever be his age, must keep himself clean in body, which cleanliness also ministers to the soul's good."⁹ So runs the instruction to the mediæval workmen. What has been said so far, no doubt, points to a very high standard of virtue amongst the older tradesmen and craftsmen.

⁷ Pastor, Vol. V., p. 65.

⁸ This custom was most probably intended to furnish amusement.

⁹ Janssen, Vol. II., pp. 33, 34.

However, there is yet to be considered another virtue which puts their character beyond the reach of imputation—their probity. This is in so striking a contrast with the chicanery and trickery of modern times that a few words on the subject may prove interesting and instructive. From the very beginning of their career no effort was spared to impress craftsmen and tradesmen with the dignity and beauty of honesty. The craft apprentice on his induction into the ranks of the journeymen solemnly pledged his honor before God to do sound honest work, and even apart from moral considerations he realized that it was to his advantage to bend every effort to the fulfillment of his vow. For he knew full well that the acquisition of the mastership depended on the execution of work which should be adjudged masterly by the best critics of the craft. Moreover, his shop and his work was subject at all times to the inspection of the guild wardens and municipal officers, who destroyed with unsparing hand everything that betokened careless or dishonest workmanship. Punishments for fraud were most severe; there were fines and expulsions and immersions in muddy pools.¹⁰ Tradesmen, too, were kept rigorously in the narrow path. Nowadays adulteration of goods causes no surprise. It seems to be the rule rather than the exception. The wine of the rich, the food of the poor, the most necessary medicines are all subject to it. In other times this would have been a most perilous venture, for a merchant who was caught in this fraud was frequently treated as a robber and put to death.¹¹

There yet remains for brief consideration two important fields in which the guilds exerted a vast influence for good, either directly or indirectly. It may seem strange to us to hear that simple, busy work-a-day men were strongly instrumental in building up the religious art and literature of the Middle Ages. But truth is often stranger than fiction. These guilds and societies that grew up within them or beside them were responsible for a vast deal of the art and literature that to-day is the marvel of travelers and students.

As we have seen, each society possessed its own church or chapel, a special object of care and veneration on the part of the members. Each guild vied with other to make its church the most beautiful in the land. Skilful guildmen threw their whole souls into the fashioning of stately façades or chaste marble altars or delicately carved screens or ivory crucifixes or jeweled vestments for their own beloved church. The best artists of the period were employed

¹⁰ In connection with penalties, it is interesting and consoling to note that the guilds had systematic punishments for breaches against purity. Indeed, so high was their regard for the angelic virtue that even indelicate remarks were punished by fines.

¹¹ Parsons, "Studies in Church History," Vol. VI., p. 543.

to decorate. In Italy, for instance, Bellini and Carpaccio and del Sarto lent their brushes to the cause, with the result that to-day many a museum of Europe is embellished with soul-inspiring works of art that originally adorned guild churches and chapels.

Of the guilds' influence in creating an ennobling literature much might be written. Long before the dawn of the Middle Ages they began to give encouragement to literary effort. Later in the days of William the Conqueror a yearly prize was offered for the best poem in honor of the Blessed Virgin. At first these literary efforts were purely lyrical; but gradually the writers caught inspiration from the beautifully dramatic ritual of the Church, with the result that their productions soon took on the character of dramas, which as early as the thirteenth century were presented with all the dignity and gorgeousness that devotion, talent and money could provide. It is wonderful how important a part these dramas came to play in the lives of the people. So popular did they become that the best litterateurs of the day bent their strongest efforts to produce a worthy miracle or mystery or morality play. The subjects for the play were drawn from the dogmas of the Church or the lives of the saints. In the beginning the plays were given in the church, but as they grew more elaborate they were removed to the open, where they were carried out on a scale of magnificence which is almost beyond belief. Renowned artists, for instance, Brunellesco, worked laboriously day in and day out to paint fitting scenery. There were marvelous light effects, too, and strange mechanism which puzzle a modern reader and tell of an ingenuity that is striking. The day chosen for the play was generally the feast day of the guild. On that day it was never gloomy by nature; such was reserved for days of penance. The festal Mass and banquet over, a merry throng gathered for the drama, which for tenderness of feeling and dignity of sentiment could hardly be surpassed. Its effects can readily be estimated by those who have seen or read "Every-Man."

In very truth these plays served the true purpose of the drama in arousing the better passion, a purpose which even the most cultured frequenters of our modern theatre would scarcely think of attaching to any plays had they not perchance read in their books of rhetoric that such is the legitimate end of the stage.

These are some of the many ways in which the Christian spirit of the guilds found picturesque expression in the lives of the people, and though the unions themselves were long since swept away by a destructive tide of neo-paganism, yet the memory of them is preserved in sweet odor. Christ's spirit towards toilers was especially deep in their souls, a temper of which our country has sore need. For protest as we may to the contrary, the condition of our work-

men is far from satisfactory. The merry song that of yore was wont to accompany the click of the tools has given way to hoarse murmurs of discontent. Wrongs are numerous and serious and call for more consideration than that shown by a shrug of the shoulders and a smart remark to the effect that the world is simply listening to the story of Dives and Lazarus once again. For be it remembered that Dives is no longer Dives and Lazarus is no longer Lazarus. The former, perchance, is as well groomed, polished, sensual, inconsiderate as ever. But over and above all this his power and the evil effects thereof are greater than ever before. And Lazarus, has he not changed? Sore afflicted he is, as from the beginning; but at this hour he lies at no man's gate, not even at his sovereign's. He no longer abides his trials in patience; Job has ceased to be his patron. He feels the power that lies in organization, and is quickly availing himself of it. The ballot is in his hand; and in its use he is largely directed by leaders who are stern fanatics in the light and wily designers under cover, men who respect no religion nor man nor God. In countries once more set in traditions and form of government than ours they have long since swung "the hewers of wood and drawers of water" into serried ranks, with the ballot as a weapon. France and Italy can tell what they accomplished, and if "Anglo-Saxon" pride persists in scorning "inferior races," what say we of their progress in Germany, Teutonic almost to the core? Scorn that, too?

It were better not to stultify ourselves. A problem presses for solution. "Frenzied finance" on the one hand and deep unrest and dissatisfaction and a grim determination to right wrongs on the other are facts that must be met. To this end two ways have been proposed; the one, the way of the head, *knowledge*; the other, the way of the head and the heart, *knowledge and religion*. As far back as 1890 Professor Marshall told a distinguished English audience that more knowledge was needed to escape on the one side the cruelty and waste of irresponsible competition and the licentious use of wealth, and the tyranny and spiritual death of an iron-bound socialism on the other. Since then day by day knowledge has grown apace. Political economy in all its branches has been reduced to quite an exact science. So great, too, has been its prominence and so minute its details that every year a comparatively new literature owes to it its origin. Newspaper and magazine and pamphlet and novel and pulpit and stage and university hall and public platform and drawing room and street corner have discussed it with the lofty air of superlative knowledge. It is on the lips of all, as well the aristocrat as the man in the street. Ways and means of relief are proposed and tried, appropriations made,

commissions appointed. Even fine ladies have taken up sociology and gone a-slumming. There are mothers' meetings and maidens' meetings, in which some grand dame, whose frequent and prolonged absence from home has reduced her acquaintance with her own children to a mere bowing formality, tells how a family should be upbrought, how many children can be supported on a slender stipend, how best to ventilate the house, how that babies sleep best lying on their stomachs, etc., etc. And yet what is the outcome of all, relief for the workman? Not a whit. Trials are still manifold and insistent. Mere knowledge cannot of its nature cure social ills. Political economy, ethical though it be and strong on its foundation in the natural law, lacks to a vast extent the higher saving spirit of Christ, the one thing necessary above all others. For when passions run high they are apt by the very force of impact to wreck the barrier of the mere natural law. Then revealed religion alone can stem the tide, not bare, cold political economy, which well merits Cardinal Manning's caustic description of "a dismal science of supply and demand, wage funds and labor markets." Knowledge has failed of this mission and will continue to fail until religion goes hand in hand with it, as was its wont.

Years ago a dear "white shepherd of Christendom"—God bless his name—realized this to the full and wrote it large in his encyclical on "The Condition of Labor." And he above all men knew whereof he spoke. For many a long weary year, instinct with the spirit of Christ, he had stood alone on the watch tower of his Master's vineyard, with ear attuned to every moan of despair and wail of distress that came up from hillside and valley below. Secluded from the world he yet felt its pulse, and wisely and tenderly did he prescribe for its ills, pleading with employer and employe alike to seek relief from their troubles by the second method, the way of the head and the heart through knowledge and religion. He would have all put on the spirit of Christ as the sovereign remedy of their ills. Then he would call back from the storied ages the old guilds and gather his reborn children into them, where they would be nourished with the bread of justice, the milk of kindness and the honey of charity. To each and every class he would hold up a patron who could guide, inspire and console. For servant maids there would be the meek, toilsome Zita, for farmers the holy Isidore, for goldsmiths Eligius or Eloy, for shoemakers Crispin, for millers Paulinus, for carpenters the just St. Joseph, model of all workmen—for each class a patron saint from the calendar of the one Church which alone inspires men of all stations and occupations to sanctify themselves by their daily duties.

This is all very fine and beautiful, perchance, yet how impractica-

ble and even Utopian! Not so. Leo's words were not in vain. Belgium heard them and profited by them; so, too, in great measure did his own beloved Italy and Spain and France, though in a much less degree. And has not our own America begun to move slowly in the right direction? There is hope of better days, for if, as sages say, "the past is never dead, but is invisibly working itself out in the present," may we not trust that God in His own good time will bring all to a happy event? Be this our solace, as we wait in patience for the Master of life to raise up amongst us men of strong, clear heads and brave, clear hearts, apostles to the poor, who, scorning prejudice of caste and education, will strive with all the forces of will and intellect to bring about at least a partial return to the better spirit of the ancient guilds.

RICHARD H. TIERNEY, S. J.

Woodstock, Md.

THE DESTRUCTION OF THE CALIFORNIA MISSIONS.

THE fate of the Christian Indians in the present State of California deserves serious consideration as a record of the practical results of political dogmatism and reckless experimenting with the social conditions of a population by rulers of another race. The secularization of the missions there was based on motives very like those proclaimed by modern politicians in the Philippines. It was put forward as a measure to lead the native converts to a higher civilization than that which they had already received from instructors acting on the motives of religion and using them to win their pupils from a savage life. In words the policy of Governors Echeandia and Figueroa can hardly be distinguished from that of Governor Taft or Wright in another part of the world as proclaimed to-day. In California the policy was carried out, however, in fact, and its results can be readily traced. How far the latter were due to lack of ability or honesty in the officials who carried out the policy and how far to its intrinsic defects can be practically ascertained from history. Most of the official documents connected with secularization have been preserved by H. H. Bancroft in his history and library. They do not reveal a lower moral standard among the Mexican officials than the daily press to-day tells of our own average politicians. Whether the promises of the latter are more likely to be fulfilled may best

be estimated from a comparison of the promises of the early Mexican politicians with their performance.

The conversion of the savages in California was begun at the foundation of San Diego as a Spanish military post in 1769, the year of Napoleon's birth. The missionaries were Franciscans of the strict observance and members of the College of San Fernando in Mexico. The college was one of several communities organized specially for the spread of the faith among the natives of New Spain. It was a self-governed body in the Franciscan Order, made up of priests who desired to devote themselves to its special work. The members usually came when already ordained, and only a few novices entered. Each college drew recruits indifferently from all the Spanish Franciscan provinces, but in practice most of the members of the San Fernando community came from Catalonia, the Island of Mallorca and the Basque provinces. These districts in the eighteenth century retained more of the old mediæval Catholic life and religious spirit than most other parts of Spain. This character is very noticeable in most of the Californian missionaries, and there is no doubt but it contributed much to their success in winning the confidence of the savages of California. The college, however, was not exclusive in its membership, and Mexican friars were also found among the latter.

Though four or five of the Spanish friars were murdered during the work of conversion, the body was decidedly successful in winning the savages to Christian belief and settled life. Five priests came with the first expedition, and the number was increased to forty by the close of the eighteenth century. At that time about fourteen thousand converts had been enrolled and formed into village communities, self-supporting and self-ruled under direction of the friars. The number of these mission villages was then eighteen, spread from San Diego to the Bay of San Francisco. The European population at the time was about twelve hundred, mostly made up of Spanish soldiers and their families, and governed by the military commander of the posts. Two colonies of settlers had been sent at government expense and towns or villages formed at San Jose, Los Angeles and Branceforte, now Santa Cruz. The settlers and Indians were kept somewhat separate in their settlements. The Governors usually left the management of the latter to their teachers, though guards of four or five soldiers were placed at each mission. Indian converts were not taxed, and the management of their local discipline and methods of work was left to the friars who had formed each settlement. Two priests were placed at each mission, and the whole number in California was about forty at the beginning of the nineteenth century. It was not

increased, but continued about the same till the close of Spanish rule in 1822.

Under this system the missions continued to grow in numbers and material prosperity during the next twenty years. The population increased to over eighteen thousand in 1810 and to about twenty-two thousand in 1823. Cultivation was extensively practiced, and the crop of 1820 reached a hundred and eighty thousand fanegas (about twelve thousand tons) of grain. Cattle and sheep owned by natives were nearly four hundred thousand. All the common manufactures of rural Spanish life were carried on by Indians in quantities ample for the use of the community. Woolen and cotton clothes, leather shoes, saddlery, pottery, soap making, smith, carpenter and mason work were produced by native labor. The mission churches and other erections were substantially built and decorated, and in food, dress, dwellings and amount of work the condition of the twenty thousand mission Indians was better than that of most European peasantry at the time. Hostilities with the savages were almost unknown and little crime existed. The natives were nearly all well instructed in religion, fairly industrious and contented with their lot. The friars gave book learning to only a few, but music and painting were widely taught. The Spanish language was also taught, but the majority continued to use their own languages, and their teachers were required to have knowledge of the dialects of their mission districts at least. A peculiarity of the system of the Spanish friars was their tolerant regard for native customs as far as not contrary to general Christian morality. Their native games were a feature of every mission holiday, and though regular work was insisted on as a duty, the friars regularly gave permission to parties to spend some weeks each year hunting and berry gathering in the fashion of their old life. They even used these excursions to cultivate the friendship of the pagan natives and induce them to join the missions.

The white population received little accession from the outside after the eighteenth century, but it increased very fast under the favorable conditions of climate, peace and plenty of supplies. The Spanish Californians numbered over three thousand in 1820, the majority of the men being still soldiers and occupied in various military duties. The settlers confined themselves to cattle raising and farming, and manufactures were confined to the mission Indians. They also raised most of the crops and supplied the garrisons with provisions, which were paid for by the authorities. There was no feeling of rivalry or ill will between the Europeans and natives in California at the time.

The European population, in spite of its military character, had

more resemblance to a peasantry of the Middle Ages than a modern colony. Public morals were strictly guarded, there was strong respect for religion and family life and but little literary culture. Provisions were abundant and wealth and poverty alike unknown. The officers usually rose from the ranks, and their families and the friars formed the only educated class, but there was little or no class feeling beyond that of military discipline. Schools were usually provided in the pueblos and presidios for elementary instruction, but a community of cattle raisers had little care for books. Music and embroidery were, however, general accomplishments of all classes. In general life in California under Spanish rule was singularly free from crime or cares.

That rule after fifty-four years' duration abruptly ended without either complaint or revolt. An insurrection in Mexico followed the seizure of the Spanish Kings by Napoleon and continued for twelve years without being noticed in California. It was nearly ended when a liberal military revolution in Madrid, in 1821, imposed a new constitution on the Spanish dominions. The Mexican royalists resented the change, and Iturbide, a Mexican officer, made an alliance with the insurgents and proclaimed the separation of Mexico from the new formed Spanish Government. The plan of Iguala proposed to continue the old Spanish monarchical régime, and even invited the King to transfer his residence to Mexico as its head. A Council of Regency was meantime installed as the legitimate government, and was accepted even by the Viceroy, O'Donoju. The Council sent an envoy to California to state its case and ask the adherence of its soldiers and people to the new State. Governor Sola called his officers and the superiors of the Franciscans to council on the subject, and after some deliberation all agreed to accept the new State as their supreme authority. It was simply a case of necessity. The passing of the Spanish monarchy was already accomplished, and the Californians accepted the fact without bitterness or partisan feeling. National prejudice there was none in California at the time between European and creole Spaniards.

Governor Sola, a Spaniard by birth, was chosen deputy to the Mexican Congress and Captain Arguello, a native of California, elected Governor until an appointment should be made by the regency. In point of fact, he continued to rule with all the powers of his Spanish predecessors for the next three years. The Mexican Empire planned by Iturbide only lasted a year. The Spanish royal family were not asked to take the throne, and Iturbide had himself elected, only to be deposed by a majority in Congress. A republic was proclaimed as the national government and a year spent in

forming a constitution, during which time California was left to its own management. Governor Arguello accepted the various changes from empire to republic with military obedience to orders.

The first President of Mexico on his election in 1825 thus found his authority in California recognized like that of the late Spanish Kings. He had no motive for interfering with its system of administration or missions, but his administration was singularly unacquainted with California's special conditions. The old Spanish officials in Mexico had been nearly all expelled. Their successors were without experience of public business and further disposed on partisan policy to discredit the old system of administration as much as possible. The latter feeling was shown in the reports of Secretary Alaman and the congressional committee on Californian affairs. Both expressed respect for the good work of the Spanish friars in civilizing the savages, but at the same time declared that "something more" was needed to raise the converts to the standard of civic perfection. Secretary Alaman thought "nothing better fitted to lead men to the highest perfection than to bind individuals to society by the powerful bond of property." He advised, accordingly, the distribution of lands to the mission Indians and lending them part of the mission funds for beginning cultivation on their own account. Both he and the committee advised that the property already formed by the converts and recognized as theirs in common by the Spanish laws should be applied to establishing colonies of foreigners among them. The Secretary suggested that these might be of Chinese and convicts from Mexico! The committee further advised that rations and small salaries should be allowed to Mexican settlers from the mission funds. How far such a disposition of the property already accumulated by the natives was to bind them more closely to society than the common ownership of the mission system none of the statesmen seemed to explain further. It is a curious illustration of the practical ignorance of Californian conditions on the part of the politicians of the new republic that Secretary Alaman referred to Upper California as "a vast and fertile peninsula." The congressional committee urged the Governor sent to California should acquaint himself with Humboldt's essay on New Spain, the history of Father Venegas and the journal of Viscaino, two hundred years published. The recommendations show the curious ignorance of Mexican officials of the conditions of California at the time.

The first Republican Governor, Colonel Echeandia, was wholly unacquainted with his province when he assumed charge of it. He was received with the same respect as his Spanish predecessors had been, and had nearly the same military and civil powers. He began

by forming an assembly to act as his council, and had them elected by vote, but with the qualification that no military man could be chosen. As seven hundred of the male population were enlisted in military service, this new provision restricted the assembly to a few boys without experience or occupation. The Governor trained them in their supposed duties as he would a band of military recruits and the representatives obeyed his instructions as implicitly. He at first ordered the mission Indians to vote as electors, but after a couple of years dispensed with their right of franchise at his discretion. He levied, however, a heavy tax on their property and had his decree endorsed by the assembly. As the Spanish settlers had no property taxes the new burdens were resented by the natives. They made no attempt at open resistance, however. A little before Echeandia's coming Governor Arguello had suppressed a petty disturbance at La Purissima by the slaughter of fifty mission Indians. Their fellows only showed their discontent by deserting in some numbers from their missions to resume savage life in the mountains.

A new element of ferocity was introduced into the relations between the whites and the savages under Echeandia's rule. One of his Mexican officers after a fight with some hostiles near San Diego sent thirty-eight pair of ears as a trophy to the Governor. It was a marked change from the forbearance uniformly practiced towards the savages by the Spanish Governors, and it lessened the confidence which the mission Indians had in the general administration up to that time. Desertions became very numerous in consequence among them.

The policy of the administration in Mexico in another way had a still more disastrous effect on the missions in California. After the fall of Iturbide the dominant majority in Congress introduced a general proscription of Spaniards by birth as a measure of partisan politics. Spaniards were forbidden access to Mexico and the college of San Fernando was almost emptied of members. Its buildings for a time were occupied as a cavalry barrack and the supply of priests to California was entirely cut off. President Victoria ordered an oath of allegiance in an iron-clad form to be tendered to the Californian friars. It included a pledge to take up arms against Spain at command of the administration. Subsequent legislation ordered the expulsion of all of Spanish birth from Mexican territory regardless of the question of allegiance. The Mexican partisan legislation was not unlike the alien and sedition measures of John Adams' administration in our own land, but it affected a much larger class. In California it was never practically applied, as many of the officers and soldiers there as well as the friars were

of Spanish birth. It was, however, effective in excluding successors to the existing missionaries, as their numbers were thinned by death and sickness. Only three friars arrived in California from the San Fernando college after the establishment of Mexican rule. They were all of Mexican birth, but no more were available in the existing conditions. The whole number of the San Fernando friars was thirty-seven in 1823. It shrank to twenty-six in 1830 and to sixteen in 1835. Continuance of their work was clearly impossible under the conditions.

Governor Echeandia, it must be said, made no serious attempt to disturb the Spanish friars except in one case. He called on them to take the oath prescribed by the President shortly after his arrival, and the majority, including Father Sarria, the mission president, refused to take it except with the qualification "as far as consistent with their religious obligations." They were ready to promise obedience to the established government and to undertake nothing against its authority, but they refused on conscientious grounds the obligation of bearing arms against their native land or the King to whom they had sworn allegiance. While Echeandia was ready to use their refusal as political capital for his own loyalty with the administration, he declined to expel the recusants on the ground of public necessity for their services. In one case, when a revolt against his own authority was made by some long unpaid soldiers, headed by a Mexican convict, he thought fit to describe it a royalist insurrection, and to give color to the charge he exiled one of the friars, Father Martinez, as an accomplice, by military authority. The Governor, however, not only declined to exile other priests, but refused to let some who desired to retire permission to leave California. His description of the value of the services of the friar body in his despatches is in curious contrast to his complaints of their nationality during the greater part of his administration.

Though the mission system was not directly attacked, a decline in the numbers of the Christian Indians began with the rule of Echeandia. The discontent caused by the new taxation and distrust of the intentions of government after the slaughter of natives at La Purissima and Santa Barbara made many leave the missions during the next few years. At San Jose, in 1827, a body of a couple of hundred under the Alcalde Estanislao went to live with the savages of the mountains and carried on hostilities with the rancheros. Another body under Yoscolo did the same at Santa Clara a little later. In neither case was any violence offered the priests in charge. Yoscolo's party was nearly exterminated by a military expedition, and Estanislao after some time was induced to return, but the mission population continued to decrease. It

had been nearly twenty-two thousand when Arguello was elected Governor. It diminished to eighteen thousand five hundred in 1830, and to somewhat over fifteen thousand five years later. The decrease in the native population followed closely that caused in the ranks of their teachers by the proscription of Spanish friars on Mexican territory.

To supply the place of the latter both the Mexican authorities and Echeandia wished to obtain Franciscans of Mexican birth. The College of Zacatecas was organized on the same model as that of San Fernando, but its members were mostly recruited from Mexico. At the request of the President an agreement was made between the two colleges by which half the Californian missions were to be ceded to the Zacatecas College. The negotiations consumed much time, and in 1830 a new President, Bustamente, was elected in Mexico. His administration was distinctly favorable to the mission system in California. Echeandia the year before had suggested the appointment of government agents to manage the revenues of the mission communities. He would leave the friars to attend to their religious instruction and general discipline, but desired to relieve them of the care of the revenues. Echeandia's proposition was rejected by the Mexican Congress and he was recalled by the President. His successor, Victoria, reached California early in 1831. Echeandia had meantime proposed to secularize the missions by his own authority, in defiance of Congress, and had won the approval of the local assembly, a body of seven young men, to his scheme. The new Governor promptly dissolved the session and began his duties of office. Echeandia in a few months stirred up some of the young assemblymen to a revolt against his successor. Governor Victoria was wounded in a skirmish, made prisoner and sent back to Mexico. Some months of confusion followed, the office of Governor being disputed between Echeandia and another officer. Both parties professed loyalty to the Mexican authority, and its administration finally named another Governor, General Figueroa. Ten friars of the Zacatecas College were sent with him, and he had orders from the President not to disturb the missions in any way.

A revolution in Mexico came to make Bustamente's authority unavailing. Santa Anna displaced him by an armed insurrection, and Figueroa promptly accepted the new administration. He was a man of few scruples, immoral, a gambler and with little fidelity to any party, but a fair soldier and shrewd politician. He was said to be partly of Indian race and had won his rank as a soldier in the old insurrection. In California he found himself without funds or soldiers, and he made it his first point to form a party favorable

to his personality among the members of the assembly and other young native sons. Without revenue from Mexico the missions were the easiest resource available for a Governor in California, and Figueroa, like Echeandia, sought popularity with a section by the promise of naming administrators for the property of the unprotected mission Indians.

The sentiments of the majority of the Spanish Californians were entirely in favor of the friars and the mission system. A few months before Echeandia's recall he had received petitions from the municipalities of San Jose, Monterey and other towns expressing their devotion to the Spanish priests and protesting against any attempt to remove them. Echeandia himself complained strongly to Figueroa of their popularity, which he attributed to the fact that they gave their religious services gratis, practiced general hospitality at the missions and aided the poor with loans and gifts. The Indians were still more devoted to their teachers and to the system of common work which they had introduced. When Echeandia in 1830 sent some officers to suggest his plan of emancipation from control of the friars to the natives at San Luis Obispo and San Miguel they almost unanimously voted to remain as they were. A canvas of families made at San Diego on the same question by Figueroa showed only two out of a hundred and sixty who were willing to leave the mission and begin life as an independent village. At San Luis Rey no one could be found to accept the so-called emancipation out of a hundred and eight families questioned.

Figueroa himself as a politician had no sympathy with the Spanish friars, and even recommended in his first communication to Mexico the banishment of Fathers Sarria and Duran, the prefect and president of the body. In view of the decided sentiments of the Indians, however, he did not venture any attempt at secularization the first year of his term, though urged for appointments by the members of the assembly. He only tried the experiment at one mission, San Juan Capistrano, and the experience of a season showed a notable decrease there both in harvests and population. The Governor wrote to the Mexican ministry of the danger of sweeping changes, and it is probable he would not have attempted any but for a peculiar turn in politics at the capital. Santa Anna, the President, retired for some months and left the administration in the hands of Vice President Farias. The latter used his authority to grant the property of the Californian missions to a colonization company, in which he was himself a stockholder. The heads of the company were Colonel Padres, who had been Echeandia's second in command, and a wealthy Mexican named Hajar. Santa

Anna on his return to office at once cancelled the grant and sent orders to that effect to Figueroa. Two hundred colonists had meantime arrived with Padres and Hajar. Figueroa refused to put them in possession of the missions and sent them to settle at Sonoma, on the north side of the bay. He felt, however, that the attempt at spoliation might soon be renewed in the distracted condition of Mexican politics. He decided to forestall its renewal by promptly placing agents of his own choice in charge of the missions. He formed a plan, had it approved by the local assembly, and without consulting the general government installed administrators in sixteen missions before the close of 1834. His own death through apoplexy followed within a few months.

Figueroa's action was not approved by the Mexican Central Government, and indeed he received its orders not to change the state of the missions as soon as it was known. The condition of Mexico itself, however, was such at the time as to make its authority in California practically nothing. The constitution was changed in 1835 from a federal to a central republic, and local disturbances, including the secession of Texas, followed. The officer sent to replace Figueroa, Colonel Chico, resigned his office in a few months without any attempt to protect the missions. Indeed, he secularized two more, Santa Inez and San Buenaventura, in a fit of pique against the friars in charge of them. A young Californian official, Alvarado, shortly afterwards drove out the acting Governor by a bloodless revolution, in which the local assembly joined. Two years of confusion followed, in which rival candidates scrambled for the office of Governor, and the general government was helpless to restore order. Finally the President decided to recognize the young insurgent as Governor, and he held office with practically no control until 1842. The last two missions, Santa Clara and San Jose, were occupied by his agents in 1836, while Alvarado was still merely an insurgent leader.

It is peculiar that the seizure of the mission property by the Californian revolutionists was not accompanied by any disrespect towards the friars themselves. When Governor Chico, in 1836, attempted to arrest Father Duran at Santa Barbara his agents were driven away by the population. Figueroa himself repeatedly applied to the Franciscan prefect for advice and treated him with high respect. The Spanish nationality, which gave umbrage in the friars to Mexican politicians, was in fact claimed by most Californian settlers. Mexicans were regarded much more as foreigners in California at the time than European Spaniards were. The San Fernando friars retained the respect and good will of all classes in California down to the death of the last in 1850. They had no

property of their own, and their defense of the rights of their converts was wholly disinterested and so recognized by even the government agents.

The Mexican Franciscans sent to aid in their work suffered the same treatment from Governor Figueroa's measures as their Spanish brethren. They never as a body had the same popularity in California as the San Fernando friars, though there was no rivalry between the two classes. National prejudice had little share in the seizure of the Californian missions. Its work was confined to the politicians of the capital, but its result in excluding from the mission work of California the only class capable of carrying it out successfully was probably the chief cause of the ruin which fell on the native population.

The welfare and advancement of the Indians was, however, the motive claimed by the advocates of secularization. Echeandia declared that he undertook it "to remove the yoke from the poor conquered natives and let them enjoy their personal liberty, the fruit of their toil and the benefits of a Christian and civil education in schools." Figueroa thought it necessary to "raise the converts from their abasement, as they had only learned how to cultivate the soil, manage horses and practice a few trades, besides a slight and superficial religious instruction." Echeandia's statement to Figueroa of the advantages he expected to realize from secularization is a curious instance of optimistic hopes. "He knew it was best to give the converts a secular form of government, as once converted into proprietors from slaves they would become enthusiastic republicans, a defense against foreign invaders and the support of the territorial administration and its troops. Further, by leaving the missionaries free for founding new missions he proposed to advance rapidly to the civilization of the multitude of savages who were also part of the Mexican nation, and by their conversion dispense with the need of immigration of foreigners."

It seems hard to imagine that such results could be seriously looked for from the legislation proposed to bring them. That was merely to put political agents in charge of the Indians' properties and separate their industrial training from religious influences over their minds. The boarding schools for young girls founded at the missions to train the children in better habits than those of their parents were to be closed, and as a substitute the new agents were "to instruct the heads of families in their parental duties. Each adult Indian was to receive a legal title to his cabin and a plot of two acres of ground and also private ownership of two cows and horses. The emancipated converts, however, were still forbidden to leave their settlements and were to continue their com-

mon work as before. The only change proposed was that their work and its wages, their punishments and rewards were to be regulated by the Governor's agents instead of the unpaid friar administrators. The fact of the new rulers being political appointees would, in the eyes of Echeandia, soon give them superior administrative ability to that of the Spanish friars, who had drawn the savages from barbarism to their existing condition." We have seen equally sanguine anticipations on a like subject expressed by American politicians seventy-five years after Echeandia's time.

His programme was put into practice, with slight modification, by Figueroa and the local assembly, a body of seven young men without further experience of politics than the lessons they had received from the first Mexican Governor. Its practical results were soon evident. At San Juan Capistrano, the first mission taken over by Figueroa's agents, the crops fell to a quarter of their former amount the first year. An examination, made by orders of Alvarado, in 1840 showed that in five years' secularized administration the cattle and sheep of the natives had fallen from three hundred to one hundred thousand. Cultivation had almost ceased, except in the vineyards and orchards. Manufactures, weaving, tanning, flouring, building and mechanical work had been abandoned everywhere except at Santa Barbara and one or two other places. The residents in the secularized missions were scarcely five thousand of the twenty-two thousand that occupied them under Spanish rule. The whole number of Christian Indians, either in the missions or scattered through the ranches, was scarcely nine thousand. Half the number of the whole had either perished or returned to savage life in five years. Raids and Indian wars were constant, and the runaway Christians often united with the savages in both. The only social elevation resulting to those who left the missions was that a portion of them were employed as vaqueros and laborers by the Spanish ranchers at nominal wages or board alone. It was customary to treat them as slaves, and a system had grown up of seizing the gentile natives as forced laborers under pretence of punishment for cattle stealing or other charges. The whole population of California at the close of the Spanish rule had been about twenty-six thousand. In 1840, after five years' mission secularization and the anarchy following, it had shrunk to less than sixteen thousand and was steadily decreasing. Agriculture, manufactures and schooling had almost vanished.

The methods followed by the young Californian Governor and his agents were not directly hostile to the natives. Their rights to the property formed by their industry under the missionary management was not denied. The Governor only professed to admin-

ister it for the common interest on approved political principles. Their practical application was that the Governor used the cattle, grain and other produce of the Indian properties as belonging to the State, and gave orders against it as freely as drafts on the public funds. His agents obeyed without hesitation in most cases. Further, both they and the Governor freely made loans of mission property to private friends or political partisans without any pretence of public services rendered. Hardly any of those loans were ever repaid. The administrators did not limit their loans to cattle, but also sent the emancipated natives in bands to work for friends without wages, and freely used the lash to compel them to work. The workshops and even farming of the missions most of them were incompetent to manage, and they let them perish through neglect. The methods of the Spanish Californian lay administrators were, in fact, almost identical with those of the Indian agents of our own Government. The chief difference was that the first plundered the property formed by Indian labor itself, the latter the price paid for Indian lands by the Government. The effect on the natives was practically the same in either case.

The consequences of the secularization policy were too notorious to escape attention even of those prominent in advocating it. Governor Alvarado himself, after his legal recognition, tried in vain to stop the ruin. The powers of the agents were restricted, the slavery of the natives by hiring them out as laborers forbidden and the settlement of Europeans among the natives prohibited. All were returns to the mission system, which had been so fluently denounced a few years earlier. Still more significant was a request of the Governor to the Spanish and Mexican friars to appoint the needed lay mayor domos themselves. It was a virtual confession of the failure of secularization, and at the same time asking the Franciscan prefects to make it workable or assume for themselves a share in responsibility for it before the public. Both Father Duran and Father Gonzalez declined the proffered power of naming administrators, however specious the promises of the Governor. They were ready to give their own work to the natives as far as instruction was concerned, but neither would assume an empty authority over their direction which might be rescinded any moment at the exigency of party politics.

The Central Government of Mexico was equally alarmed at the decay of population and industries in California which had followed the destruction of the Spanish mission system. Its restoration could only be expected by agents like those who had built it up; but that class of men had been so long excluded by partisan prejudices that its revival could not be looked for. Congress and the

President, as the best they could do, obtained the erection of a diocese in California, with one of the Franciscan missionaries as its first Bishop. The pious fund for support of the missions was transferred to his management. The Bishop was asked to employ it in forming and maintaining a secular clergy to replace the fast disappearing friars. The President a little later ordered that the mission properties should be placed again in control of the latter. The Central Government had recovered some power in California through the general disgust of its people with the incompetent rule of Alvarado. Petitions were sent for the nomination of a new Governor and the sending of a body of Mexican troops to maintain order in the territory and protect it against foreign invasion. The President sent General Micheltorena in 1842, with about three hundred men. He had orders to restore the missions to the management of the friars, without distinction of Spanish or Mexican.

The change was made in 1843, but only extended to twelve of the twenty-one former missions. In the other nine the population had disappeared to an extent which made it hopeless to restore them. The Governor showed good will, but he had little means of giving effective help in recovering the property stolen or lent by the lay administrators. He granted, however, a tract of six leagues public land near Santa Inez to the Bishop for the support of a seminary. The condition of the missions of the south was reported on by Father Duran in 1844 shortly after the recession. San Diego had only a hundred natives left on its lands of the eighteen hundred that occupied them in Spanish times. They had neither cattle nor cultivated ground to support them. San Luis Rey had four hundred of the twenty-eight hundred that lived there under the benevolent Father Peyri. San Gabriel had three hundred, who made a livelihood by cultivation of its vineyards; Santa Barbara nearly the same, mainly depending on work in the mission shops, which had still been kept open by Father Jimerio.

From nearly every mission came like figures of material ruin. There were but eight left of the Spanish friars, who had been thirty-seven when the rule of Mexico was accepted in 1822. The Mexican Franciscans just kept up their original number often, and there was no means to increase them in the existing conditions of Mexico. The politicians of the young republic twenty years earlier desired to remove the Spanish missionaries and keep their missions much as Charles III. had banished the Jesuits from Lower California and found successors to continue their work in the Spanish Franciscans. The process could not be repealed at the whim of political prejudice. The disappearance of the Franciscans from Californian soil was followed by that of the population formed and guided by

them. The government which brought this result only survived the destruction of the missions by less than a year.

The well-meant effort to form a secular clergy to keep up the work of the Franciscan missionaries by the ordinary agencies of the Church was doomed to failure also. Bishop Garcia Diego began a seminary, but could find no candidates for the priesthood among the native Californians even with the promise of liberal salaries for clerical duties. He brought four or five students from Mexico, two of Indian race, and ordained three, but no further recruits offered themselves. The financial promises of the republican authorities were made of little avail by the difficulties of the administration to find funds for its own maintenance. The President applied to the Bishop's agent for a "loan" to meet the demands on himself of Federal officeholders. When it was refused the administration of the fund was put back in the hands of a government agent. Within a couple of years its estates were sold to tide over some urgent deficit in the treasury. The government at the same time disclaimed any purpose of confiscation. It declared the fund sacred to its original purposes and merely borrowed it as a matter of State necessity.

The situation thus created in California was made worse by a local insurrection against the Mexican Governor. The mission properties no longer offered any large plunder, and the insurrection seems to have been merely an ebullition of boyish recklessness on the part of a section of the native Californians. The only motive alleged was that the Mexican soldiers sent to garrison the forts were of inferior moral character, though no serious outrages were complained of. Micheltorena gave up his office rather than wage war, and a native Californian, Pio Pico, was installed as Governor simply on the ground of being oldest in the local assembly. He promptly ordered a sale of the remaining mission lands on his own authority. The sole motive was to satisfy the claims of a few personal partisans who had aided in the insurrection. The sales were ordered in 1845, and within less than a year the American invasion followed. The revolutionary Governor promptly left the country and the rule of Mexico ended within a year of the destruction of the native mission communities.

The Christian Indians received no benefit from the change of government. Only two of the Spanish friars survived when the conquest was completed, and no advocate of native rights appeared to take their place, though the latter were guaranteed by the treaty which transferred California to the Union. The survivors were scattered in small parties into remote districts, where the barren soil offered no temptation to encroachment by white men. Their

number to-day is estimated at about four thousand. Their present condition was summed up three years ago by Mr. Lummis, an American publicist, who had been commissioned to investigate it by the administration: "The former owners of this land have been dispossessed of their fertile valleys, sometimes under color of law, sometimes at the end of a shot gun, and driven back on the ragged edge of the desert. Almost nothing that a white man would take as a gift has been left these original Americans."

The practical result of the secularization policy inaugurated by the policy of a couple of Mexican Governors "to raise the mission Indians from the abasement of their condition" could not be more clearly told. One asks whether better may be expected from attempts to raise the standard of civilization of other races won from barbarism by Catholic teaching and now submitted to plans of moral reformation through political agencies.

B. J. CLINCH.

San Francisco, Cal.

DO THE FILIPINOS REALLY HATE THE SPANISH FRIARS?

II.

THE Filipino, if he gets into any position, is always a tyrant and oppressor of the poor, and what chance has the latter of legal redress for the most crying wrongs if the President and Secretary and Judge of the Peace, all native, conspire to deprive him of his rights? One of the great reasons why the friar had to intervene in local secular affairs in Spanish times was to protect the rights of the poorer classes. The priest was the father of the poor in the Philippines, as he is in every other part of the world. Naturally these criminals are afraid that if the friars return the poor will go to them, their former advisers and protectors, whom they had always looked to for the redress of their grievances, and bring the illegal and unjust doings to the light of day. Little does the American journalist, in search of information, suspect what crimes against humanity may underlie the discourse of the suave, polished and well-spoken Filipino, who assures him of the violent and general hatred existing among the poorer classes for the Spanish friar.

The journalist who wrote a series of letters from the Philippines

for a newspaper syndicate, amongst other inaccuracies he fell into, said that "most of the friars were living idly in Manila, as they could not go into the country for fear of the vengeance of the former parishioners." The fact is that in spite of all drawbacks, in spite of the virulent hatred of the irreligious element, the interested motives of a local opposition and the cowardice of their own friends, about a hundred of the friars of the different orders are to be found in the provinces. Of those living in Manila very few are available for outside parish work, and even the orders have had to refuse some parishes. Of the Dominicans, owing to the number employed in teaching in the university and their three colleges, and the development of their missions in China and Japan, not more than seven or eight could go back to the parishes. Our journalist seems to think that the only reason that keeps the friars in Manila is to look after their property. Has he been present at any of the grand religious functions in their churches, not to be surpassed in any other city of the world? Has he witnessed the magnificent religious processions through the streets of the city, taken part in by many thousands? He is evidently not aware that many of their former parishioners seek them out in Manila to unburthen their consciences to them in the confessional. Naturally, too, the Spaniards when they attend their religious duties prefer to go to them than to any others. A good number of friars are required in Manila from the fact that a large portion of the spiritual work of the city is in their hands.

As to the work in the provinces, at present there are four Dominican Fathers in Manaoag, one in the province of Bataan, two in Lingayan, six in the college at Dagupan, nine in the college of Tuguegarao, while five are acting as missionaries in the small Batanes Islands to the north of Luzon. The Franciscans hold between twenty or thirty parishes in the southern provinces of Luzon and in Samar, and one father is parish priest of Baler, where he was kept in captivity for twenty-two months during the revolution and the war with America. His persecutor is now confined in Bilibid prison, convicted of several murders. The fathers, owing to the scarcity of priests, have generally two or three parishes under their charge and are doing herculean work. They all seem to take a very hopeful view of their position in the provinces. More have been petitioned for, but the difficulty now is that the supply in Manila has fallen short, there being hardly enough friars in the Franciscan convent to keep up the Divine worship. The Recoleta friars are in Cebu, Bacoor (Cavite), Infanta and Candelaria (Zambales), Calapan (Mindoro), Cuyo (Calamianes), Puerto Princesa (La Paragua), Bacolod, Murcia, Minuluan, San Carlos (Negros),

Palilan and Aloran (Mindanao), and some fathers are on the missions in the Marianas Islands. The Augustinians have two fathers in the north of Luzon and several others in the Island of Paney and in the town of Cebu. In view of the tremendous opposition, this is a fair showing, but after all what are these for the guidance of nearly seven millions of Catholics?

One of the grave questions that the Church in the Philippines will have to solve in the near future is the support of the priests. In Spanish times they had their salary from the government, an arrangement that relieved them from sordid cares and enabled them without difficulty to keep the church and convent in good repair. In addition they had the burial and marriage fees and the alms for Masses. As at present they have to depend entirely on those latter sources of income, there being no such thing as collections in the churches, and the Filipino not being by nature an alms-giver, especially the rich, it may be imagined that the position of the friars in the provinces is not a bed of roses. The head convents in Manila, except the Franciscan, have been heavily taxed for the support of some of the priests, especially those on the missions. I made inquiries in one convent situated in a large capital town as to the amount of fees received during the year for burials and marriages, the fees being generally about a dollar, and found that they amounted to \$268 for the year, one-eighth of which was to be set apart as church funds for repairs, and the rest, together with what alms was received for Masses, had to suffice for the entire support of two priests. This shows badly by the side of the American teacher of the primary school, who gets at least a salary of \$1,000 a year. As the graveyards belonging to the churches, which used to be an additional source of income, have been seized in most instances by the municipalities, who divide the fees among themselves, there is no possibility of making extensive repairs to the churches and convents, and most of them are in a dilapidated state. The furniture in the convents is of the most meagre description, sometimes being a loan from friends in the town or village, while the possessors of the stolen property, which formerly belonged to them, such is the mystery of the Filipino character, will not only be seen in the church at Mass, but will meet the fathers in an amiable and friendly way without showing or feeling any sense of shame.

Turning back to the period of the revolution, the attitude of the parishioners to their friar pastors during that awful period has been very much misrepresented. It is cunningly explained that the war was not made against Spain, but against the religious orders, and was the outgrowth of the hatred felt by a people groaning under "monastic oppression." The first news wired to Europe from the

news agencies in Hong Kong was that the people had everywhere risen in rebellion against the "monks," as they were called, had killed some and were pursuing others through the mountains.

Thus public opinion was prejudiced from the start, for it was inferred that tyranny or oppression of some magnitude must have been practiced by the friars that drove the people to such extremities. This was the first of the many absurd and malicious reports sent to Europe during the year 1898. Now, in no single instance was a friar made prisoner or maltreated by his own parishioners; the truth is, that it was not the people of the parishes who rose against the friars, but the Katipunero revolutionists, almost all Tagalos from the provinces of Manila or Cavite. Great numbers of these had never known the friars as pastors, had had very few relations with them and were the usual proletariat to be found in and near all great cities and seaports, ready for crime at all times and ripe for revolution. To these must be added the bandits (*tulisanes*) of the mountains of Cavite and Batangas, who in company with criminals escaped from justice, had pursued brigandage as an hereditary profession for generations. This rabble formed into bands with military organization, and armed with guns and rifles taken from the arsenal of Cavite or supplied from his stores by Admiral Dewey, overran the whole country like a horde of barbarians, striking terror into friend and foe alike, pillaging and maltreating peaceful Chinamen traders and their own countrymen, burning the houses of those who did not show them active sympathy, besieging the scattered detachments of the Spanish military forces and taking possession of the towns in the name of the "Philippine Republic," leaving in them their own military governors, to whom the presidents were ordered to pay implicit obedience. The friars had ample time to leave their parishes after the first alarm, but in most instances deferred their departure till the Katipuneros were almost at their heels. Finding then it was too late to get to Manila, encircled at the time by the revolutionary forces, they took refuge in the towns garrisoned by the Spaniards and were taken prisoners when the latter capitulated. Several of the friars of Pangasinan, after leaving their parishes with the church plate, vestments and funds, were taken at the surrender of Dagupan. A large number drawn from Cagayan, Ilocos and La Union, together with the Bishops of Vigan, were taken at the surrender of Aparri while waiting for a ship to convey them to Hong Kong. Several also were made prisoners after the capitulation of Cebu. In all these instances their capture and subsequent ill treatment were the work of the Tagalo Katipuneros.

By the terms of the capitulations, formally signed by the Tagalo

chiefs, they were to go free, their lives and property being respected, but the treaties were shamefully broken by these ruffians as soon as the Spaniards were in their power. Lowering themselves to the level of common bandits, they made prisoners of men, women and children, including the friars, in expectation of large ransoms from the Spanish Government. This execrable perfidy was committed by direct orders from Aguinaldo and the other chiefs of the new Republic, who should thereby forfeit all right to a place in public estimation. The siege of Calamba, the town belonging to the great Dominican estate, by Paciano Rizal, the brother of the famous Dr. José Rizal, is a case in point. Rizal treated the friars most respectfully when the Spanish soldiers had capitulated, and, as had been agreed, facilitated their return to Manila. When, however, they got to the revolutionary lines drawn around the city they were made prisoners and brought to Cavite to Aguinaldo, the pass given by Rizal, a general of their own army, being utterly disregarded.

In the southern islands the friars remained quietly at their work for weeks after the revolution had begun in Luzon, never imagining that they would be disturbed so far away from the scene of operations. However, the Tagalo bands sailed south and were guilty of the same course of perfidy and violence as in the north. All the friars could have saved themselves at their leisure, as did those of the province of Capiz, who sailed to Manila, taking with them the church funds of the province, amounting to \$70,000.

The cruel sufferings and humiliations endured during their long captivity were entirely the work of the revolutionary leaders and could not be attributed except in occasional instances to the rank and file of the Katipunero soldiery. Against all the rules of civilized warfare they affected to regard them as criminals amenable to justice for crimes committed against the people, and not as prisoners of war. Aguinaldo and his Cabinet, helped in this course by the advice of the American Consul at Hong Kong, kept more than two hundred friars prisoners for eighteen months, subjecting them at the beginning to outrages and torture to extract confessions relating to the disposal of church funds, and forcing many of them to engage in menial and filthy occupations, such as scraping the streets, cleaning outhouses and serving at table as servants.

The Spanish soldiers, new conscripts, who had never handled a gun before they came to the Philippines, were subjected to similar treatment and made to work as slaves. More than eighty Spanish marines captured at Cavite, after bearing their awful lot for more than a year, were deliberately murdered by a Tagalo general when the American troops advanced on his position. This was the inhuman conduct of men who posed as the saviors of their country,

vaunted their noble aspirations before the world and thought themselves capable of setting up a civilized government over the ruins they had made.

The real feelings of the people as distinguished from the Katipuneros were made manifest on the memorable journey made by the friar prisoners in company with a large number of Spanish prisoners of war from Cavite to the north of Luzon, passing in their way through the Tagalo and Ilocano provinces. Except in two or three of the Tagalo towns, centres of the revolutionists and where pandemonium reigned, they were not insulted; on the contrary, in spite of orders that the people were to have no intercourse with them, they were usually received with respect and kindness by the president and the leading families, and got food and other comforts so readily that some of the Spanish soldiers shaved their heads and tried to pose as friars to receive the same good treatment. The respect shown by the people reacted on their guards, who treated them with far more lenience than they meted out to the Spanish soldiers.

Lieutenant Gilmour, who with twelve other American naval prisoners had to march for several days with the column, notices in his account of his captivity the cruel treatment meted out to the soldiers, the poor fellows being cruelly beaten to make them march on when they were hardly able to stir. This never happened to the friars, who were treated with consideration by the rank and file of the Katipuneros and were never assaulted except by special commands. "You are good men," they would sometimes say. "We know you are good men; it is the religious orders that are bad." Of real hostility to the friars there was none. "What are you doing all this for?" said a friar one day to his guards. "Independence," was the sapient reply. "What is independence?" he asked. "Cuba, Cuba," was all the explanation that could be elicited. As in most revolutions, the bulk of them were led by the nose and did not know what they were fighting for. In Isabela the friars were treated very well by the first Tagalo band that came and made them prisoners. It was not till the arrival of the chiefs, Leyba and Villa, that they were subjected to beating and other tortures in order to extract money. Father Martinez, the present prior of Santo Domingo, in Manila, was beaten twice to insensibility by Leyba's orders to make him confess where he had placed the church funds, amounting to several thousands of dollars. He had managed to send them to Manila, where they were taken care of by the procurator of the Dominican Order till the arrival last year of Dr. O'Doherty, the American Bishop of Vigan, when they were handed over to him as head of the diocese. Leyba also threatened to shoot the present sub-prior of Santo Domingo, Father Peña, if he did not declare

that Jesus Christ was not present in the Blessed Sacrament. "Shoot away," was the heroic answer. "You might as well shoot and have done with it." Leyba lowered the revolver and shot him in the leg. This Leyba, a half Spaniard, was assassinated afterwards by his own soldiers for his cruelties. Villa, the other chief, who is now practising as a doctor in Manila, is a Tagalo who received his education gratis from the Dominican friars at the University of St. Thomas, in Manila, and went to Aguinaldo's camp as his follower and physician the very morning after he had received his degrees. In Isabela he insulted and struck one of his former professors and kicked the Bishop of Vigan in the stomach and broke his arm because he would not ordain a certain young man he proposed to him. He tortured to death a Spanish lieutenant of the Guardia Civil against whom he had a grudge, hanging him up and cutting off pieces of his flesh, which he shoved into his mouth, subjecting him to other abominable and indescribable outrages and for three days and nights gloated over his agonies till death mercifully took him out of his power. After the departure of Leyba and Villa the friars in Isabela received no more bad treatment till the end of their imprisonment. In the Island of Negros, where the Tagalos had no sway, it having formed a government of its own, the friars, though imprisoned according to the general policy pursued, were not subjected to ill treatment; in fact, one of the heads of the new government spent some hundreds of dollars out of his own private fortune in sending them necessities. They were all released after three months, their release being accelerated from the circumstances that their former parishioners were coming in crowds every day to condole with them and bring them presents. The prison was fast becoming a place of pilgrimage.

Capital has been made by the mendacious Foreman out of the assassination of friars, of which forty cases occurred between 1896 and 1898, by representing them as acts of vengeance committed on tyrants by an oppressed and infuriated people. At least that will be gathered from the cool and dispassionate way in which he records them and the sneers with which he follows some of the victims to their untimely end, all the more remarkable in a man who had enjoyed free and unlimited hospitality from the friars for years in his journeys through the islands and counted personal friends, such as Father Moises Santos, of Malolos, among the slain. Except in a man of perverted moral sense and consummate hypocrisy the attitude is incomprehensible, especially as when he alleges cruelty on the part of Spain he reprobates it in the strongest terms. When analyzed the murders do not bear the interpretation put on them, the greater number having happened at the first onset of the

revolution, when the bloody statutes of the Katipunan society founded by Andres Bonifacio, a warehouse porter in Manila, decreed death to all Spaniards—men, women and children—and found victims of both sexes and all ages. Seventeen friars were killed in Cavite in the rising of 1896, most of them at the defense of the estate house at Imus, where with a few lay Spaniards they were besieged by the first revolutionary band, which included a number of bandits from the mountains. After expending their ammunition they made a sally and were killed indiscriminately in the heat of the conflict as they fled fighting towards the seashore.

It is foolish to represent them as agrarian murders committed by the tenants on the friars' estates, apparent from the fact that the following year when the trouble was over for a time all the old tenants were back on the farms working away as usual under the superintendence of the lay Brother in charge. Three other friars in the same province taken prisoners by Aguinaldo were foully murdered in prison by Andres Bonifacio. Outside this province no prisoners were murdered during the first rising. At the beginning of the rebellion in 1898, and in a few instances before it, seven were assassinated in Zambalez, three in Bataan, five in Bulacan, one in Tarlac, one in Pampanga, three in Ilocos and three in Cebu. It will be noticed that nearly all the murders occurred in the Tagalo provinces around Manila. For all the other provinces, in which were eight or nine hundred defenseless friars, the only murders claimed are the three in Cebu. Even in the Tagalo provinces the murderers were not local men, but in most instances Katipunero chiefs sent from Manila to organize the rising. Considering the bloodthirsty programme of the Katipuneros, the orders given by Bonifacio and sworn to by his followers to murder every Spaniard, without distinction of sex, and also that the very first victims of the bloody orgie intended were not Spaniards, but some harmless Chinese in Caloocan murdered in cold blood, the wonder is that the friars were not slain in hundreds. What argument can be drawn from the assassination of a certain number of them when we reflect on the thousands of murders committed by the Tagalo Katipuneros on their own countrymen about the same period, including the massacre of 150 Machabebe soldiers after the capitulation of Samal? Add to this account the hundreds of lay Spaniards, including prisoners of war and others, hundreds of Chinese traders and coolies, American soldiers tortured and buried alive, all victims of Tagalo cruelty and lust of blood, and it will be felt how ridiculous is the assumption that the friars were an object of vengeance, except to a few, or that the revolution was brought about principally on account of them.

The following is a remarkable instance of utter failure of the Katipunan leaders to enlist the mass of the population in their campaign of cruelty of the friars while they had them in their power in prison: They sent round to all the parishes inviting them to forward bills of complaints against the friars that they might punish them for their past misdeeds. They were thankful for any contribution of this nature, however trifling or childish, Leyba having given a friar a severe beating for having used a humorous expression about the Philippines in a letter written by him six years before to another friar and found among the latter's papers. The friars got several hints of what was intended and felt very anxious, as they were aware that their enemies would take every advantage of the most absurd accusation to torture and revile them. However, the communications received from the parishes were generally so laudatory of the friar pastors, advantage being taken of the occasion to add a petition for their return and restoration, that it was deemed more prudent to shelve them and let the whole matter drop.

It was in 1900, when the friars had all escaped from captivity and were crowded in Manila, that the controversy about their return to the parishes began, which has been carried on with such bitterness by their enemies ever since. The provincials of the orders, in their evidence given before the Taft Commission, declared, as we have already seen, that they were in constant communication with the parishioners, and added that the friars could go back as soon as their personal safety could be guaranteed, but that the provinces were then entirely under the control of the Katipunan Society.

When the insurgents had lain down their arms and the provinces were under the rule of American military governors the restoration was baffled by the native clergy, many of them past insurgents and members of the Katipunan Society, who, united almost to a man, moved heaven and earth to keep the friars out. The good of religion was entirely subordinated by them to their own personal interests, and it is no exaggeration to say that it is owing to their selfish policy more than to any other cause that the Filipino people have been largely deprived of spiritual ministrations ever since, the children left without religious instruction and the churches in the unoccupied parishes seized by the Aglipayans, these seizures going on up to the present time. In my journeys through the islands I interviewed many of these pastors of souls and hardly ever could elicit a word of regret as to the inadequate number of priests, even in parishes consisting of 20,000 or 30,000 Catholics. An American who had spent nearly four years as military governor over one of the southern provinces and had learned the true inwardness of the

situation told me he had met cases in which a strong opposition had manifested itself among the people of a parish when a proposal would be made to restore the friars, that reasons would be given and accusation made of every crime, but that on examination he would find that it was all the work of a subservient mob led on by the native priests, who did not want to vacate the positions given to them by the revolutionists nor relinquish the church revenues, which they were spending without giving an account of to any superior. A proof to his mind that the real sentiments of the people were not as represented was the fact that when there was no native priest in a parish there was no opposition, but where there was one quite the opposite sentiment seemed to prevail, and he cited particular instances that had come under his personal observation. Coming from a non-Catholic, this evidence may be considered important. To the native priests must be attributed the strongly-worded petitions presented to the American military governors from the very parishes where the friars had had the recent evidence of their own eyes of the real sentiments of the people towards them. In the Cagayan valley, north of Luzon, the keeping out of the friars may be attributed very largely to the efforts of one old priest who belonged to a prominent family and exercised enormous influence. If that influence had been used in the right direction he could have installed them in every parish, bearing down all opposition from the Katipuneros, who were very weak in that part of the country.

The Katipunan, the Supreme Society of the Sons of the People, to give it its full title, did not cease to exercise a malign influence over the people even when the war was over. Torture and death were threatened to those who showed sympathy with the Spanish friars, who spoke well of them or helped their cause, just as it had been applied during the war to their own fellow-countrymen suspected of being *Americanistas*. This society has aroused the dormant anti-racial hatred of the Asiatic for the white man, a feeling considerably strengthened during the sanguinary course of the war, and thus a new element has been introduced into the anti-friar campaign that did not exist before. The friars are white men—why should they, members of that dominant race, be allowed to come back to the parishes and exercise that unbounded influence over the Filipino people that they would have as their pastors? The Katipuneros would pitch every American teacher or soldier or civilian into the sea if they could, but why try the impossible?

The Federal party, formed at the breaking up of the insurrectionary forces and occupying a commanding influence in the islands, gave a wonderfully organized strength to the anti-friar opposition. Though not professedly an anti-Catholic party, it acts as such and

speaks as such by its leaders, who are atheists, freethinkers and men high placed in the ranks of Latin Freemasonry. They would drive the friars out of the Philippines on the same principles on which the religious orders have been driven out of France. Against the three-fold opposition emanating from the native clergy for personal reasons, the Katipunan from anti-racial rancor, and the Federal party from anti-religious and anti-Christian principles, it was impossible to make headway, though all these classes formed but a small minority of the population; so great numbers of the friars set sail from Manila to seek in other lands a more favorable field for their labors. Still more would have left only that Mgr. Chapelle, who stood nobly by the friars in this crisis when they seemed abandoned by all their friends, counseled them to remain in Manila and wait for better times.

Every year, however, the situation has become more difficult, owing to the rise of Aglipayism, a revolutionary movement, the daily tendency of which, in conjunction with the Filipino press, consists of a vilification of the friars and everything relating to them. During the seven years that have passed since the friars left the provinces a new generation of youths has grown up who were only little boys when the friars lived amongst them. It is in the ranks of these that Aglipay counts many converts to his political schemes. Their young minds have been perverted by the vile Filipino press and the vulgar diatribes of the Aglipayan ministers. The *fraile* is in their eyes the embodiment of tyranny and every vice—just the popular Protestant idea of the Jesuit that still lingers among the English. And here let it be noted of what astounding import mere words may be to a simple and ignorant people. In Spanish times the word *fraile* was never known in common parlance. The friar was addressed by the endearing term of *padre*, and this appellation was always used by the natives when speaking of their pastors. They were *los padres*, or *the fathers*. Even the lay Brothers, managers of the estates, got the same title by courtesy from the tenants and servants, and right proud they were of it. The word *fraile* only came into common use among the Spanish in the Philippines when it had become in their mouths a term of contempt, and in this degenerated state was handed over to the anti-clerical Filipinos. In some parts of the islands a particularly noxious and stinging insect has received this name, undoubtedly from the Spaniards. The anti-clerical Filipinos have improved on this. In the list brought out by the new Tagalo Academy they translate *fraile* by mountebank, giving the alternate translation of fat-paunch in addition. Cognate words have been coined as terms of reproach and contempt, such as *frailero* and *frailista*, both of

which mean a friend or partisan of the friars. The friar, therefore, at present seems to many an ignorant Filipino to have two sides and present a double character. As a *padre* he arouses pleasant memories of the past, and is everything that is good and lovable; as a *fraile* he stands out as the object of the incessant vituperation of the past few years, and is everything that is bad and noxious. Can it be wondered at that the mind of the common laborer is in a state of bewilderment that is positively amusing? He likes the *padres*, but he does not like the *frailes*. On one occasion the population of a parish petitioned for the service of a priest. "Send us," they said, "Augustinian Fathers or Dominicans, we do not care which, but do not send us any *frailes*." It is possible that in time, when the memory of the friars has entirely disappeared and other generations have grown up under new conditions, that the falsehoods about them may have grown into a strong tradition, to the entire exclusion of the truth, as happened in England with regard to the monks after the Protestant Reformation. It may be that in half a century from this the memory of these glorious champions of the faith may be held in execration as tyrants and oppressors of the poor. It is well, therefore, to anticipate that time and let the world know that the friars in the Philippines have had the same record of self-sacrifice and love of the poor and lowly that has distinguished Catholic missionaries in all other lands, and that they possessed the love and veneration of their flocks up to the last moment they were with them.

The young blood in the Aglipayan movement is a new factor in the problem which will make it more difficult of solution for some years to come. I remember a very unpleasant experience I had in a town in Pangasinan, where I had gone from Manila to assist at the *fiesta* at the invitation of the school teacher. There had never been the smallest friction in this town between the friars and the people; in fact, the last of the fathers, a specially zealous and charitable man, was remembered by the people with veneration. However, Aglipayism was introduced into the town by one of the Filipino school teachers, who managed to range under its standard most of the youths and school boys, so that before long hardly a young man was seen at Mass on Sundays. The influence of the new spirit was apparent from the fact, which I learned afterwards, that those zealous converts had determined to stone me for my presumption in entering the town, and were only deterred from their project by the president stating at a meeting specially convened for the occasion that if I were attacked he would be obliged to defend me with the aid of the police, according to his interpretation of Governor Taft's letter about the rights of friars as citizens.

The consequence was that I experienced nothing worse than black looks. The attitude of the common people towards me, who had gathered in thousands from the surrounding country, was most mystifying. If these people came to Manaoag it would be most difficult for me or any other friar to pass through them, owing to the desire of all to salute and kiss the hand of the priest, whereas here I walked through the crowd in the Dominican habit, seen for the first time in the town since the revolution, and there was no greeting, no salute, no surprise expressed, numbers appearing not even to see me. No one equals the ordinary Filipino in the power of concealing his feelings by an apathetic look; his face seldom betrays him. A few youths and boys had cowed that multitude into a show of neutrality and utter indifference. If I had been attacked not a hand would have been raised to assist me. At the school celebration in the evening a young Aglipayan minister attacked the doctrine practised by the Catholic Church under cover of an attack on the friars, and although the parish priest was present as well as another native priest and the audience was Catholic, not a murmur of disapproval was heard from any one. When I got up to protest I found no one to second me, my remarks being received in profound silence. What can be expected of a people who show such arrant cowardice, who are so destitute of moral courage? Is it a wonder they allow themselves to be led like sheep by any leader who presents himself? If the good Catholics were a little more resolute the course of events would take a different direction.

It is, however, surprising how in places where the sinister influences we have described have not been at work or have ceased working for a time, the old order of things is ready to assert itself and the innate love and respect of the people for the friars to make itself manifest. The case received an illustration in the early part of the present year, when two Dominican friars, professors in the University of Manila, took a journey to the province of Albay, the great centre of the hemp industry and at present the most prosperous of all the provinces. On the excursions they made to several parts of the province during their two months' stay there they were received with the greatest cordiality by the native clergy and the people, who feted them in their houses and insisted on their taking the time-honored gifts in those parts of chickens and eggs. The clergy engaged them to preach in their churches during Holy Week, when all classes crowded to hear their sermons. This extraordinary manifestation of feeling was attributed by them in great measure to the circumstance that the clergy were the first to do them honor, gave them hospitality in their presbyteries and accompanied them from place to place on their journeys.

The melancholy truth apparent to the least observant mind is that the six or seven millions of Filipino Catholics are being robbed of their faith by intimidation and violence, with as fixed a determination as in any other country cursed by the presence of Latin Freemasonry, mercilessly robbed of the faith introduced and kept alive amongst them for three centuries and a half by the heroic and self-sacrificing labors of the Spanish friars. The same process is being carried through its stages there which has reduced the more flourishing Christian population of South America to their present level. Education and contact with Europe produces a class of natives and half-breeds in tropical climes who combine with revolutionary and anarchic ideas the most advanced forms of militant atheism. They regard the practices of the Catholic religion by their poorer countrymen as fanaticism and condemn the most elementary justice and fair play in their efforts to stamp it out. Let the Philippines be granted independence, and it will not be long in arriving at the same stage as Venezuela, where no foreign priest, regular or secular, is allowed to land in the country. The only hope is that the American sovereignty over the islands will be always strong enough to put down intimidation and secure that personal liberty to the people and their pastors which is enjoyed by the Catholics in the United States. Freedom if given at present to the revolutionary party would mean the reducing of nine-tenths of the Filipinos to the most abject slavery and the destruction of the Catholic religion in the Philippine Archipelago.

AMBROSE COLEMAN, O. P.

Limerick, Ireland.

THE NATURE OF CATHOLIC MYSTICISM.

STRANGE as the statement may sound in the midst of the rush and the riot of our merely industrial pursuits and ambitions, it is nevertheless true that the spirit of mysticism is in the air. Spiritualism in most, if not in all of its features, Christian Science, Theosophy, or which is practically the same thing, Buddhism, even Hypnotism in its illegitimate uses, and the many other forms of the occultism which prevails to-day, are simply diverse practices of a false and reprehensible mysticism. The country is covered with the votaries, victims, priests and priestesses of the occult. It is, in fact, a sign of the times. On the one hand, the old heresies have been riddled to pieces by the persistent attacks

of modern science, the license of private interpretation, higher criticism, journalistic ridicule, secular education and the growing contempt in which all shams and pretences in the garb of religion are everywhere held in literature and in the life of the people. These heterodox makeshifts for spirituality and communion with the Unseen no longer appeal to the people nor possess any credit with thinking men and women. They never did make men holy, and now they have ceased even to render them religious. On the other hand, man instinctively leans towards the mystic. Perhaps it would be too radical, as it is certainly untrue, to say that by nature he is superstitious. Yet it is not only true, as Tertullian writes, "*quod anima humana est naturaliter Christiana*," but it is even more certain that man is curious about God and everything touching the departed; about spirits, heaven, hell, the forces of nature, the hidden powers of his own being and the yet unexplored realms of the hereafter. The religious man is not content with simply moral goodness. Unaided he can reason out a higher finish for the soul and its faculties than the merely negative state of sinlessness. Furthermore, the soul in him feels itself akin to a people of a finer life and a subtler activity. He is surrounded by an invisible world, out of which he recognizes that he has issued by his creation, and into which he is to return with his death; so that even in his subconscious moods he is counting upon his chances and his fortunes in that world of finalities. Far down in his soul, even when he fails or refuses to admit it, is the conviction that somehow his most substantial interests lie in the direction of the spirit land. He feels that all the problems of his existence are to find their solution in the study of the other world, that the true experience of God, that the only exact knowledge of his own destiny, that the proper comprehension of the Unseen is—such is the popular persuasion and error—to come to him through his intimacy with and his guidance by the invisible spirits about him.

TRUE MYSTICISM BASED UPON CATHOLIC DOGMA.

Man has always looked to religion to recognize, to cultivate and to perfect this mystic instinct of his nature. Hence in every vicissitude of man's religious life we discover the principles and the practice of the mystic life set forth as the sublimest scope of the theology he professes. But the development of man's mystic faculties by religion has not always been in harmony with reason and revelation. For there is a true mysticism and a false mysticism. Where it is not a mockery of religion, or a dallying with the supernatural, mysticism is wound up with religion and calls forth the exercise of the sublimest forces in man's religious propensities. Moreover,

mysticism takes after religion. Hence true mysticism postulates the true religion; that is to say, the Christian religion in its only true form, the teachings of the Catholic Church. And as to-day the non-Catholic world is slowly drifting towards atheism or occultism in the garb of some religious or scientific cult, it is more than merely opportune, it is even necessary, to set forth the doctrine and principles of this true mysticism often and in many ways. This is all the more called for just now because there exists so widespread an ignorance upon the relation of mysticism to religion in general, and especially touching the truth that the home of true mysticism is in the bosom of the Catholic Church; and because, secondly, the time seems to have arrived in modern religious decadence when this feature of Catholic teaching and practice should be more than hitherto insisted upon for the guidance and profit of earnest souls and for the confusion of evil-minded propagandists of the occult.

WHAT IS MYSTICISM?

Mysticism is almost as old as man himself. In its most ancient and fundamental sense it signifies initiation in mystery, and the initiated were termed mystics. Hence mysticism came to mean, as far back as the days of Clement of Alexandria, the possession of a wisdom unknown and foreign to the knowledge of the ordinary people. Conceived of in this generic sense, mysticism comprehends a twofold element. It is the outcome of an illumination superior to any intelligence vouchsafed to man on the ordinary level of human experience. It implies in the next place a spiritual activity begotten and nourished by a vitality whose source is loftier than that of the ordinary ascetic life of man. It is, therefore, an understanding and a life which is peculiar to the adept and denied to the multitude. In this broad sense every Catholic is in quite a true use of the term a mystic. He is by his baptism and the ministry of the word to him initiated in mysteries and truth not understood or possessed and realized by those outside the pale of Christian teaching. By his participation in the life of the sacraments, by his part in the august Sacrifice of the Mass and his union with the multitudinous prayer that goes up to God from the bosom of the Church, he puts forth an activity and leads a supernatural life which is impossible outside the "little flock of Christ." Yet this concept of the mystic, just because it is perhaps too broad, fails to exhibit the more exclusively accepted and orthodox notion of the Catholic mystic. For at every period of her existence the Church has been alive with men and women of a wisdom so lofty and with virtues of so extraordinary and heroic a character that the spiritual insight

and the supernatural habits to be found among the faithful at large are not at all comparable with them in nature or effect. These are the true Catholic mystics. Their state, their life is an extraordinary one. This privileged condition of the religious man—for I hesitate to describe it as an acquired habit—is an elevation of the soul above the influence of the senses and the sphere of the sensible world into an atmosphere of calm and contemplation approaching, at least remotely and in the sublime exercise of the nobler faculties, the state of angelic beings or the condition of incorporate spirits. In this state the soul leads a life closely united to God and is prepared in a privileged manner for the life of the beatific vision, that is to say, for that divine rapture which is to constitute the blessedness of our future existence. Catholic mysticism, accordingly, is far more than a mere persistence in the true faith, with an humble observance of the law of God, with confusion and sorrow and confession of sin, with participation in sacrifice and sacrament and with an abiding love of God and our neighbor—features which exhibit the best there is in the ordinary life of the Church and her children.

ITS ROOT LIES IN MAN'S DUAL NATURE.

Yet this extraordinary state of the soul is not an unnatural one. For mysticism of every kind is wound up with the dual nature of man; and while it deals with objects and experiences lying above and beyond the sphere of normal human activity, it does not in any instance call forth the play of forces the potentiality of which is not rooted in man's faculties. Man is a compound of matter and spirit. By their substantial union in him they *intrinsically* constitute him a unit agent; *extrinsically* they put him in relation with a threefold world—the world of matter beneath him, the world of men around him and the world of spirits and God above him. Accordingly his manner of acting is twofold—ordinary and extraordinary. Man's habitual, ordinary and simply natural activity is that of a rationally animated organism. As such the material element, his body, and the spiritual element, his soul, act simultaneously, not indeed as independent units, but interdependently as complementary forces of the same agent. His threefold relation, therefore, to nature, man and spirit is maintained and manifested not as body only, nor as mind only, but as he naturally and normally is and acts; that is, as a rationally animated body or organism. For the condition and fundamental basis of man's ordinary state is that in him as a person matter and mind or the rational soul exist, live, act and manifest themselves as a unit.

Man acts in an extraordinary manner whenever this unity is interrupted. For in so far as a man may be conceived as living exclusively as matter, or exclusively as spirit, that is, in so far as his life follows exclusively the laws which govern matter, such as the laws of inorganic bodies and plants and animals, or follows the laws which govern the soul and intelligent beings, he effects two changes in himself. He suspends his intercourse with the set of objects which correspond to one element of his nature and puts himself in direct communication with the objects of the other element in his nature. Thus, if he so disturbs the equilibrium of his life-forces as to make his corporeal faculties the source and medium of his vital activities, he thereby cuts himself off from the things of the soul and from the superior spirits around him; and to the extent that he pursues this separation, to that same extent does he identify himself with matter and render himself homogeneous with merely vegetable and animal propensities; to that same extent does he live as a simple product of nature, like a mere plant or animal. In the same way, if he cultivates the spirit-life only, he undermines the forces of activity of his body; he denies himself to the objects of the material element in him; and to the extent that he separates himself from the body and the things that are congenial to it he becomes identified with the life of the soul alone, and so homogeneous with its laws that he lives a life analogous to that of a spirit. Every such disturbance of man's dual activity and every displacement of the centre of his life-forces from their habitual unison, to the exclusive use of either his material or spiritual powers, puts him in an abnormal condition and makes his life and his manner of acting extraordinary.

But that which is extraordinary is not for that reason unnatural. For while it is perfectly natural that matter and spirit, which constitute the human person, mutually interpenetrate and act the one through the other, nevertheless human nature is such that the predominance of the one or the other of its substantial elements is entirely possible independently and exclusively of the other. Matter, notwithstanding its substantial union with spirit and the modifications which it receives from it, always remains what it essentially is, matter, and the spirit remains essentially spirit. Under these circumstances, therefore, the body of man can act as merely organized matter and the soul as merely independent spirit. So that the extraordinary in the mystic's life and actions is not that he goes counter to any law of his nature, but that he lives and acts differently from the habitual law of his nature. His condition is, therefore, an exception to the laws of his being, not a subversion of the essential order of things in himself and his faculties.

NATURE OF THE KNOWLEDGE POSSESSED BY THE MYSTIC.

Persons existing in any of these extraordinary states are in consequence possessed of a knowledge and realize experiences which are foreign to the uninitiated and beyond the reach of other men. The states themselves and the phenomena exhibited in them appear incomprehensible, and they are more or less inexplicable to those who have no experience in the mystical life. That a man see and describe things and events that exist entirely outside the field of his vision; that he hear sounds so far away that the ear cannot catch them; that he foretell future events and reveal the secrets of hearts is something inexplicable on merely natural grounds. For the rule is to see corporeal objects through the medium of the eye, to hear things with the ear, to know nothing of the future but what is revealed to us. These extraordinary powers are mystical powers, and those who are gifted with them are mystics or individuals in whom the faculties and forces act in a manner out of the ordinary and attain to their objects without following the beaten path of human activity. Naturally these powers are of many kinds, using the term mysticism in its largest sense. For on the one hand the sphere of man's activity is manifold; on the other, the phenomena of mysticism occur whenever any one of the elements or faculties of man's activity ceases to coöperate with the others or any one of his many forms of activity gets into direct and immediate intercourse with its object. Such combinations are fairly innumerable, and to each of them corresponds a form of mysticism. To enumerate them would be interminable. They are, however, capable of classification, and the result is a twofold mysticism—a mysticism whose object is God and a mysticism whose object is the creature. The latter, like the creature, is threefold—that whose object is nature, that whose object is man, that whose object are the invisible spirits around us. For outside of God there are three kingdoms of creatures: spiritual and invisible beings, visible and inorganic substances and organic natures. These constitute a link between the spiritual and the inorganic world.

OCCULTISM OR NATURAL MAGIC.

Man is preëminently the type and the representative of this last species of being. He unites in his composite nature the trinity of beings that goes to make up creation. He is accordingly by his constitution put in relation with all other beings, whether these are below him or above him in the order of creation. This relation can be and has been the basis of a threefold species of mysticism. In the first place, man can turn towards the nature beneath him and

give himself wholly to the study, service and worship of its forces, mysteries and phenomena. The outcome is natural mysticism. This was the mysticism of pagan antiquity. In the forms, grades and orgies of this mysticism—more correctly termed occultism—it is the inferior and organic nature in man which enters into intercourse with the divers realms of the world beneath him and which in virtue of the sympathy which renders them akin draws down with it the spiritual forces and superior faculties in his nature. It would be a mistake, however, to suppose that this natural mysticism, however inferior to religious mysticism in its source and objects, is in itself and originally evil. Nature and its forces and its mysteries are the work of God, and in so far they cannot be evil in their relation to man. Yet there has been danger in this mysticism from the day that sin separated creation from God. The effects of the fall were felt even to the uttermost limits of physical nature, causing everywhere a profound division and conflict. Thenceforth a double principle invaded the universe; the one wholesome and conservative, the other malicious and direful. For this schism of the fall, primevally originating in the realm of spirits, inaugurated an irreconcilable war between the spirits of light, whose mission is order, harmony and beauty in external nature, and the spirits of darkness, who ever seek to create trouble, confusion and horror in the works of God. These two cities, the City of God and the City of Satan, exist everywhere and always, and man placed in the midst of their battles finds as well in the evil seeds which sin has deposited in his being as in the good which remains to him after the fall attractions which may and do solicit him in one direction as well as in the other, making him party to the powers of evil as well as a votary of the spirits which do the work of God in the world. In this dangerous alternative lies the evil and the risk to man of the cult of and familiar intercourse with occultism or purely natural mysticism.

THE PHENOMENA OF SPIRITISM.

Besides this natural magic there is another and, in a way, a higher order of mysticism. It is and has often been called psychic mysticism. But among modern writers it is now, I believe, more usually known as spiritism, employing the term in its inclusive or widest sense. It is as much indeed a natural mysticism as magic, but because its source and its object are not simply the physical forces of matter it is distinguished from natural mysticism. Psychic mysticism has its subjective sources in the higher faculties or powers of man. It is largely an abuse of the nerves. In its practice it is true that the mind and especially the will of the medium are primarily acted upon or brought under mystic influence. But this extrinsic

influence reaches even the sensitive and inferior man, pervading his organic potencies and subserving the minutest and most intimate features of his nature to the determinations of this control. In many instances it even eliminates the individuality of the mind and will in favor of some foreign control. In this manner all man's psychic forces are penetrated with the result of this extraordinary influence—call it exaltation of soul, nervous excitation, sixth sense, extension of the psychologic faculties or even obsession—in virtue of which man's life for the time being is merged into a manifold intercourse with the threefold order of spirits—demons, dead men and angels. In this intercourse he comes to know things, to realize experiences, even to do things unknown to and impossible to the ordinary run of mortals. There are developed in him the diverse features of clairvoyance, mind reading, telepathy and the other numerous phenomena of magnetism, hypnotism and spiritism to be met with everywhere in the modern world of occultism.

DIVINE VS. DIABOLIC MYSTICISM.

Psychic mysticism, like natural mysticism, is essentially profane. It puts man in relation with creatures only. For this reason it is distinguished from religious or supernatural mysticism. Religious mysticism has God and the world of God's spirits for its object; and the religious mystic is one who lives in direct communion with God. For this reason religious mysticism is justly termed divine mysticism, while psychic and natural mysticism, perforce of their ready abuse by Satan, are called diabolic mysticism. The distinction is a just one, and is to be absolutely insisted upon where the mysticism of the true religion is in question. For all religions culminate or aim to culminate in mysticism. Mysticism is the highest expression of religion. But the mysticism of false religions is, as such, merely diabolic mysticism, for the same reasons that spiritism, or natural mysticism, are stigmatized as diabolic. Whatever is preternatural in them and attributable to the presence of intelligence, is simply commerce with the devil. For there is hardly a single form of profane mysticism, from the old pagan oracles to the manifestations of the ouija and to spirit rapping, that has not more or less frequently and definitely exhibited the presence of a malign intelligence. Besides, there exists all the difference in the world between the principles and works of these two mysticisms. Diabolic mysticism conducts man through an abuse of creatures and an unholy interpretation of the laws and mysteries of nature to a mystical union with the prince of darkness. Divine mysticism creates in man a contempt of the things that make him sin, detaches him from all that leads away from God and by a proper use of

creatures leads him upwards into a mystical union with the Lord of Light. In it the sublime truths of our faith are revealed to the soul under the divine light of revelation and through the teachings of the Church. The mysteries and hidden things of God are made clear to the mind of the Christian mystic. At the same time his will is strengthened with a heaven-descended force for the exertion of acts of heroic virtue, and often, too, for the utterance of prophecy and the working of most stupendous miracles. In diabolic mysticism the false light of the mind is the gloomy fire of hell. In it the votary of occultism never sees the true, the useful, the good and the beautiful. The Evil One is ever deceiving him with vain and futile knowledge, and the works he performs are but impostures and marvels that mimic only and challenge the works of God's saints and mystics. Thus while the graces vouchsafed to the divine mystic effect so extraordinary an abstinence and mortification in him that the very nature of his body seems to be altered and spiritualized, and ecstasies, bi-locations and the other phenomena that we so often meet with in the lives of the saints become almost con-natural features of his activity; we see, on the other hand, in diabolic mysticism, and as it were offsetting these marvels, every sort of excess, diabolic raptures, aerial flights, distant manifestations and the countless other infernal phenomena that characterize the possessed or obsessed victims of satanic mysticism. For if, as it is true, divine mysticism tends to transform man into God and to liken him to the Divine Word, diabolic mysticism seeks to change man into a devil and liken him to Satan. The one specially prepares man for heaven, the other renders him particularly fit for hell.

THE DIVINE MYSTIC PASSIVE IN THE HANDS OF GOD.

Yet there is the widest difference in the process by which man is made a divine mystic and that by which he is perfected in the service of the devil. Diabolic mysticism is from the beginning throughout a matter of man's own choice and work. He enters into this satanic intercourse by the simple invocation of the demon. He progresses in it by formal compact with or implicit surrender to the evil spirit, and he crowns the malice of his diabolic familiarities by such a gradual and entire surrender of himself to his malign master that he becomes in will, fancy, mind and often even in the powers and movements of his body so intimately one with the angel of darkness that eventually he is completely at the mercy and in the entire control of the devil. In divine mysticism, on the contrary, God, not man, is the principal, nay, the sole agent or active force. No man, whatever the merits of his sanctity, can initiate a life of mysticism in himself. The call to this life must come from

God alone. It is indeed in the power of the soul to prepare itself by the ascetic practices of the Christian life for this intimate communion with her divine Spouse; but she must passively await the moment when she will be introduced into the inner chamber of divine contemplation. The mystical life is, as we have said, inaugurated in the soul by the extraordinary grace of a call to this higher life. Once in it the soul is drawn further and further towards God until she is finally sublimated into a mystical union with Him. In consequence of this sublime union a radical change invades the whole being of the truly religious mystic. Whereas in satanic mysticism man seeks himself and in so far surrenders himself to the devil as to attain through him to some knowledge, experience or object beyond his native powers to reach, the true or divine mystic wholly loses himself in the immensity of God, living and acting only in God and for God. In the practice of the moral life, upon which the edifice of true mysticism must everywhere rest, the religious mystic has eradicated every iniquity from his soul. In the ascetic preparation for this life of union with God he has purified himself of even his legitimate affections, and finally in his mystical holocaust of himself he has consummated his sacrifice by handing himself over body and soul to Him from whom he has received all things. In return God works in him and through him those wonders which transcend the scope and powers of nature to accomplish. Not indeed that the life of the divine mystic consists essentially in visions, ecstasies, prophecies and other divine or extraordinary graces. These, when they are legitimate and authentic, are but signs and features of the mystical life. Essentially this life is to be found in that extraordinary activity in the supernatural order which has its source in an extraordinary enlightenment and a singular force and excitation of soul coming into it, in a privileged manner, from God Himself. The mystical life is for this reason the nursery of Christian heroes. It is the garden of heroic virtues. These virtues do not, of course, differ from the ordinary Christian virtues in kind or even in appearance. Their exercise only is different. This is perfect in the mystic and extraordinary even in its perfection. For in the mystical life, more so by far than in the moral and ascetic life, the work of sanctification goes forward through extirpation and spiritual upbuilding. In it not only are the passions mortified, but they are plucked out by the very roots, and charity carried upwards to the heights of most extraordinary excellence. For as all the exercises of the ascetic life go to perfect charity, so, too, the mystic life inflames the heart of man with heroic charity and an intense love of divine union. The principle therefore of the mystic life, as it is of the ascetic life, is charity. In the

ascetic life this principle is some degree of perfect charity; in the mystic life this degree is heroic.

THE GIFT OF CONTEMPLATION AND ITS REWARD.

The source of this extraordinary charity, or rather the principal exercise by which God introduces the soul into the ways of the mystic life and through which He illumines and arouses her to the practice of the most exalted and heroic virtues, is the gift of infused prayer or contemplation. All things, therefore, in the mystical life come back to this sublime form of prayer, to this extraordinary insight into God and the things of God. For we distinguish a twofold knowledge and communion with God—the ordinary, in which God is the object of man's thoughts and the ultimate end of all his activities attainable through the natural or usual exercise of his rational faculties. This knowledge comes to man from the study of the works of God, from the dictates of reason and from the teachings of positive revelation. The other is extraordinary. It comes to man with the gift of infused prayer, through the immediate contemplation of God, in which the mystic's mind is illumined by an extraordinary divine light, which enables him to perceive divine truths with ease and affords him a deep insight into the hidden things of God. In this immediate contemplation of God, and in the life or actions which it animates, man is borne out of himself. He becomes rapt up into the thought, the idea, the vision of God thus vouchsafed to him. In its loftiest and most perfect expression this contemplative knowledge of God is ecstasy. For in ecstasy man ceases to live, to know, in the ordinary way. All his life seems to go into this single exercise of his illuminated mind. The other elements or forces of his being converge apparently towards this one act. They seem to vanish in favor of this one absorbing activity, in as much as the ways and means through which, in his ordinary life, communion with God was maintained are now, to all intents and purposes, suspended. His life, under the influence of this sublime knowledge of God, is all in God, of God and for God. This is the highest exercise of true mysticism and the source from which the marvelous works of the mystical life emanate in all their preternatural features.

MYSTICISM OUTSIDE OF CATHOLICITY.

It has been said that divine mysticism is possible only in the Catholic religion. This may not be absolutely true in individual instances and isolated acts. For on the one hand the immediate contemplation of God is radically or potentially congenital to the

highest development of man's intellectual forces. On the other hand, God can and may put Himself in immediate communication with any one of His creatures if He sees fit to do so for His own sublime ends. If, however, mysticism as a life or cult is ever possible outside the true Church, it must necessarily be a false or imperfect mysticism. For mysticism is necessarily of a piece with the doctrine of God, upon which it is based. If this is false, the mysticism to which it gives life is also false. If it is imperfect or piecemeal, the mysticism which is founded upon it is also imperfect and without consistency. For divine mysticism is not and cannot be a thing, a life, apart from religion. It is a species, an extraordinary form of the religious life. In its last analysis it is the union of man with God in knowledge and love. The truly divine mystic, therefore, is impossible in that religious life whose knowledge of God and whose habitual conscience is not founded on the true idea of God and upon the perfect expression of God's revelation. For God, however we may approach the study of Him, is the object of our religious life and is the same God whether we are in mediate or immediate communion with Him. Now God is not truly known except through the teachings of the Catholic Church, and in consequence Catholic mysticism is the only feature of the mystical life which is founded upon the true and complete knowledge of God. It is the only true mysticism. In fact, looked at in this correct way, divine mysticism is only possible within the pale of Catholicity.

In paganism there is no true union of God and man. Pagan mysticism is a refined Pantheism, in which God disappears in man, or man more frequently is transformed into God. The act of contemplation is an apotheosis of man through a concentration of all his mental forces upon a study of the hidden powers of his own being; or it is a self-annihilation of man, who is lost in the knowledge of the grandeur of the concept of God. There is never in paganism any real communing of one being with the other, and in consequence no true mysticism. In Judaism a true mysticism is impossible. In the Judaic dispensation a vast abyss stretched out between God and man—the abyss of the Incarnation. This abyss has never been bridged over and never will be traversed by the aspiration of the Jewish mystic. In his religion there was the mysticism of prophecy and the mystery of the Messianic promises; but never the only true and complete ground of divine mysticism—the assumption of human nature to the divinity in the fact of the Incarnation. The full revelation of God was wanting, and in consequence a true and complete union of God and man was impossible. Heresy is a parting of the seamless garment of Christ. It is a rejection of the authority of the Incarnate God and the exaltation

in its place of that pride of human reason which is so inimical not only to the perfect union of mysticism, but to the very lowest grades of divine charity. For there can be no approach to God where there is no Christian humility, no obedience to the authority of the God-man and no zeal for the integrity of His Holy Gospels. In the Catholic dispensation alone, therefore, we have a true, a perfect mysticism. In the teachings and practice of this union with God there is no apotheosis of man and no annihilation of the individual mystic. Yet the approach to God is closer and more complete than is conceivable in paganism. The duality of man and God, the distinction between the creature and the creator, is preserved, as against the pantheistic confusion of God and man in the mysticism of Greece and Rome or the occultism of modern India. On the other hand, the abyss separating God and man in Judaism is bridged over. God and man are united in the Incarnation, and the God-man is supernaturally made manifest to the world in the twofold revelation which He has left to the world in either Testament. There is no waiting for the fulfillment of prophecy or the realization of promises. The knowledge of God available to man is complete, and in as far as the dispensation of God with man is concerned is final in every detail. Moreover, this knowledge of God, so essential to the union of God with man, is guaranteed to us in its truth and entirety by the infallible *magisterium* which the God-man Himself founded among men unto the consummation of things for its propagation to the ends of time and space. It is a knowledge of God and of His blessed spirits, and of man, and of heaven, and of hell, and of the world of the hereafter, which is fixed and immune from change and error. It is in Catholicity therefore that we find the true knowledge of God, and therefore the complete union of God with man in divine mysticism.

THE MAN-GOD THE PERFECT EXPRESSION OF MYSTICISM.

As we have already intimated, the perfect expression of Catholic mysticism is in the Man-God; or, to express the same truth more consistently with the fact, Catholic mysticism is realized most perfectly in the Man-God. In the Incarnate Word we have in a single person the perfect likeness of man to God and the infinite difference between the human and divine nature. We possess in the hypostatic union the most immediate converse of man with God, and apart from the personality of the Word there is in Christ a duality of all things that go to make man and all the attributes that constitute God. Some writers on mysticism see in the Cross not simply the sign and symbol of Catholic mysticism, which we all see, but the root and the start of every mystic feature of Christianity. For

it is by the sign of the Cross, these writers claim, that Christ is the type and model of divine mysticism—in His doctrine, which purifies the soul; in His Passion, by which He conquered death, and in His triumph, which opened the way to heaven and God. Priest at once and victim, Christ by His sacrifice upon the altar of the Cross has left the impress of His double character upon the inmost recesses of His own being and transmitted it on to us in that mysticism which purifies the souls of men. This sign followed Him to the tomb. It rose with Him from the dead. It is the mark of those who are humble with Christ; it is the symbol of the elect. It followed Christ when He ascended into heaven, and will come with Him to judge the living and the dead. The Cross, then, is to do for every man and for the world what is done in Christ, the type and model of man and of creation—to mark all things for God. This theory of mysticism sees the impress of the Cross upon all things. It sees the boughs, branches, leaves and flowers of the plant world evolving after the type of the Cross. The bird in his flight, with head advanced, his wings extended, his feet and tail thrown back, suggests to it the figure of the Cross in the beings of the air. The swimming of the fish in the water, the prowling of the tiger in the jungle, the race of the camel across the sand plain, or the bounding of the stag from peak to peak upon the mountain heights are alive to these mystics with the thought of the Cross. Every existing substance, in the eyes of this mystic interpretation of symbolism, is but a reflex of the Cross. The central essence is the summit of the Cross. The outer accidents and multiple elements that go to integrate the substance suggest the shaft of the Cross. And the arms of the sacred emblem are represented by the bonds and forces which hold the elements in immovable union with their central and immovable essence. But above all in man is the mystic impress of the Cross seen clearly through every feature of his composition. In signing himself with the sign of the Cross, man touches as it were with the ends of the blessed emblem his head, the pit of his stomach, his left shoulder and then his right, finishing the sign with his hand upon his breast. The act is one accomplished in the will of man before it is made upon the body. It is made upon his soul and upon his body. It signs the head of man and all the organs it represents with the name of the Father. In the name of the Son it signs the heart and all the organic systems that minister to the life of man. His arms and hands, with the complicated muscular system which they represent, are signed in like manner in the name of the Holy Ghost. With the entire Cross man signs himself, body and soul, in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; and in so doing he signs the

whole world with the great emblem of divine mysticism, inasmuch as the whole man is the reflex and epitome of the universe.

We must, however, observe of this pious conception of Catholic mysticism that while it is true that the Cross is in this wonderful manner wound up with every feature of Catholic mysticism, it is so only inasmuch as it is the symbol of Christ's work and the monument of His death. Christ's death is the great central event in the world's life which inaugurated the advent of true mysticism on earth, through the redemption, which was wrought out upon the altar of the Cross. It is thus the life-work of the Man-God which lends to the Cross its mystical force and efficacy. Accordingly it is in Christ that is accomplished the perfect union of God and man, and not in the symbolism of the Cross, except in so far as the Cross represents the merit and grace of union which comes to us through Christ. It is upon Christ, therefore, that the Christian is to build, if he would realize in himself in any degree the life which is to put him in immediate union with God. For the imitation of Christ is the starting point, as it must ultimately be the goal, of Catholic mysticism.

MYSTIC LIKENESS TO CHRIST POSSIBLE IN THE CHURCH.

Is this likeness to Christ, the Man-God, demanded by divine mysticism possible to men? Is this immediate union or intercourse with God so sublimely illustrated in Christ, and in which the terms to the relation are not destroyed but preserved in their original attributes possible to any and all the members of the Church of Christ? It is, provided there is the special call from God to this exalted union, and provided that the pursuit of this life is based upon the mystery of the Man-God. For that is possible which has been realized. The hypostatic union of God with man is not, of course, realizable in any other than Christ, but this union—the highest intercourse of man with God—being once and forever a fact in the relation of man with God, every inferior mystic union of God with man becomes, in virtue of this union, a possibility to all the followers of Christ. Yet whatever the degree of this mystical union of man with God, it is to be effected through the same divine medium that intervened in the Incarnation, the medium of the Holy Ghost. "And the angel answering said to her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee. And therefore the Holy One which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." The mystical union of man with God so sublimely, perfectly and substantially realized in the Man-God is to be effected in the members of the Church of Christ through the mediation of the Holy Ghost, not indeed in the

sublime, substantial manner in which it is realized in Christ, but imperfectly and extrinsically through the faculties and exercises which subserve the life of divine contemplation. The mysticism therefore realized in Christ is communicated to the faithful through the action of the Holy Ghost.

But this action of sanctification is not exerted directly and immediately upon the soul, but mediately and through the ministry of the Church. For Christ lives in the Church. The Church is Christ perpetuating Himself and His activity among men. In consequence of this indwelling of Christ in the Church, divine mysticism is realized in a permanent manner in the Church. The immediate and perfect union of man with God goes on forever in the Church. The faithful, in view of their participation of all the holy things of the Church, possess the power of ingrafting upon their own individual lives the mysticism realized in Christ. For the Church is the sum of the faithful, and each member of the faithful is a reflex of the Church. He is an image of the Church. He is an abridgement of the Church. And this relation of each member of the faithful to the Church exhibits and explains the manner in which under the special call of God each member of the Church can participate in the mysticism of Christ. However, it is to be observed that isolated and abridged parts of a whole are never exact copies of the whole, nor do they ever realize the perfection of the whole. There is a disparity between the whole and its component parts. There is therefore a difference in the way in which the mysticism which the Church inherits from Christ exists in the Church and the way in which it exists in the Man-God. And, secondly, there is a difference in the manner in which the mysticism which is permanent in the Church exists in the Church and the manner in which the same mysticism is realized in each member of the Church of Christ.

THE MYSTICAL LIFE IN CHRIST AND IN THE CHURCH.

In Christ the mystical life is an undivided activity. In Him all the functions of the mystical life constitute a unit force. Christ is at one and the same time Prophet, Priest and King, and jurisdiction, worship and doctrine are in Him not three distinct phases of the mystical union of man with God in Christ, but these three functions are one and the same mystical union itself and the very reality which constitutes the mysticism of Christ. But that which exists in Christ as a unit and as an undivided force or life exists in the Church in a multiple and a divided manner. The unit mysticism of Christ is exhibited and evolved in the Church through a three-fold principle of development. For the Church is not the personal

God-Man, and she does not reveal her humano-divine nature to the world except through the medium of her representative actions. These actions are mainly three, and they correspond on the one hand with the threefold function of Christ, her Founder, and on the other with the threefold character of her divine mission. Of these actions the preaching of the Church constitutes the fundamental basis of all legitimate mysticism. This action of the Church corresponds to the prophetic or teaching function of Christ. Through the voice of the Church God shows Himself in search of an intimacy with man in this vale of his burdens. "Come to me all you who are burdened and I will refresh you." Through the message of His Gospel God over and over again repeats and emphasizes His love for man. "Greater love," He says, "than this no man has, that a man lay down his life for his friends." And again: "If any one love me he will keep my word, and my Father will love him, and we will come to him, and we will make our abode with him."

In a word, in the doctrine of the Church is set forth the principle, law and practice of that sublime life which is to bring God and man together on this earth in the most intimate union—the principle, the law and the practice of the life of Christ, who said of Himself: "I am the way, the truth and the life." "I am the vine, you are the branches; the same beareth much fruit, for without me you can do nothing." Next to the great doctrinal function of the Church, in virtue of which man is united to God in his mind, memory and will, the three directive powers of his spiritual existence, the sacerdotal function of Christ is perpetuated in the ubiquitous life of divine worship in the Church. In the exercise of this sublime act of divine worship in the Church, God and the members of God's Church are put and preserved in an intimate union one with the other. It is, moreover, a threefold union. For it is a sacramental union, in which, through the fountain of divine grace that flows into the Church through the sevenfold channel of the sacraments, God lives and acts in the souls of men. It is a sacrificial union. In the Mass, the sacrifice which exists everywhere in the Church from the rising to the setting of the sun, man and God are united and mutually react, the one upon the other, as Victim and Sacrificer, as Ransom and Captive, as Food and Body, as Priest and Most High God. It is the union of prayer. For in the prayer that is going up to God everywhere in the Church, and in the spirit of meditation with which the Church in the lives of so many of her children is ever occupied with the things of God, the faithful live in God and act in Him through the spirit and virtue of faith, hope, charity and cleansing sorrow. But besides the prophetic and sacer-

dotal function of Christ thus perpetuated in the Church, the royal prerogative of the Man-God is continued and exercised through the discipline and manifold form of jurisdiction by which the Church governs and conducts the faithful to the goal of that perfection to which their baptism has ordained each one, and by which she realizes the will of her Divine Founder in the multitude, character and perfection of her external life and works. Now it is in this sum of the Church's life and action, it is in this threefold principle of supernatural or spiritual development by which the Church accomplishes the work of man's sanctification that we find revealed the extent of the immediate union between God and man in the Church. They constitute so many degrees in the mystical life of the Church, rising one above the other, in the order of an excellence in which the exercises of the royal function of Christ in the Church is superior to the prophetic mission of the Church, and in which the sacerdotal function, especially in the august Sacrifice of the Mass, exhibits the most sacred and stupendous features of Catholic mysticism. For it is in the most Holy Sacrifice of the Mass that divine mysticism attains to the highest possible degree of mystery and development in the Church.

**HOW THE MYSTICAL LIFE OF CHRIST AND THE CHURCH IS INGRAFTED
UPON THE INDIVIDUAL LIVES OF THE FAITHFUL.**

It remains now to be seen how this mysticism of Christ, perpetuated and developed in the Church by the triple function of preaching, discipline and worship, is ingrafted upon the individual lives of the faithful. To begin with, man is, as we have said, a member of the Church in which the mysticism of Christ is perpetuated. As such he participates in his right of a Catholic in this mysticism of Christ. That is to say, each member of the Church, for just the reason that he is a member of Christ's Church, possesses some degree of union and intimacy with God. Yet this mystical life, which comes to each one of the faithful in virtue of his union with the Church, is not reproduced in him either in its reality or in its work, equally and in the same absolute manner that it is perpetuated in the Church. Nor is the reason of this hard to find. For although the individual man is a member of the body which we call the Church, he is at the same time, when placed face to face with the Church, partially or inadequately distinct from the Church. The Church is something outside of him, and therefore objective to him. In like manner the threefold work or mystic function of the Church is not a feature of himself, but a life and activity outside of himself. It is for him and to him a subject of knowledge and of study. It is a spiritual life to be assimilated. It is a substance

which it is in his power to appropriate. It is a rule of life. It is a model, a means, a principle by which he is to shape his own religious existence. This each member of the Church realizes and makes the basis of his relations and attitude towards the threefold function of mystical development in the Church. Hence it is that in every member of the faithful a threefold practice or conformity exists corresponding to the three features of the Church's life and work. In each one of the faithful there exists the virtue and practice of faith, a condition which corresponds to the teaching office of the Church, and through which the faithful ingraft upon their lives and conduct the principles and doctrine of Christ as taught to them by the Church. In each member of the Church there also flourishes the spirit and practice of religion or divine worship as exhibited in the participation of the sacraments, the oblation of daily sacrifice and the diverse exercise of prayer, meditation and contemplation. In each dutiful child of the Church we find a deep-seated solicitude for the fulfillment of the whole law and for the realization of the will of God in all the interior and exterior works of his earthly life, a realization and a solicitude which correspond and are in every detail of Christian duty proportioned to the disciplinary office of the Church and to her royal prerogative of universal jurisdiction.

Still the Catholic man or woman is not a mystic in the exact sense of the word, simply because as a member of the Church he puts on the mysticism of the Church. To a certain extent he is, even in this view, a truly mystical person. He comes before us as a person in immediate intercourse with his God. His activity as a member of the Church emanates, through divine grace, immediately from God in a very true sense. His works are done in God and for God; for "As the Father raises up the dead and giveth life, so the Son also giveth life to whom He will." Yet man takes on this mystical character only in as far as the Church is individualized in him, and we see in him and in any act of his the Church herself and some one or other feature of the manifold activity which is permanently emanating from her divine life. He is a mystic in this sense because he is of the mystical body of Christ. But when we consider any member of the Church in himself and for himself, and look upon his actions as actions proceeding from an individual, independent agent, he is a mystic in his own individual character, and his mystical life will take on the personal features given to it by the traits of his individual nature under the disposition of the special perfection imparted to it by divine grace. It is true that his personal intercourse with God is still realized through the Church, and that his works have God immediately in view for the

reason that he lives in the Church, and that he participates of the life of the Church. But in his individual as opposed to his corporate, mystical character, he participates in this life as something objective to himself. He participates in it as a doctrine to which he assents and which he follows as a light; as a worship in which he participates as the highest duty of his existence; as a discipline to which he submits as the surest law of sanctity. In this way the mystical life that is realized in him is his own mystical life. It is begotten in him by various means and in various degrees. Its basis is faith, which comes to him by hearing the word of God. Its exercise is worship, the sacraments, prayer. Its safeguard is obedience to the authority of the Church. Its postulate is the moral law. Its immediate preparation is the ascetic life. Its fulfillment is the manifold perfection of the contemplative life. When this life of contemplation has been realized, Catholic mysticism is the result. And that member of the Church in whose existence the works and practice of the life of contemplation are exhibited to that degree of perfection which we venerate in the lives of many of the saints, affords us an example of the genuine Catholic mystic. For such a one is extraordinary in the intimacy of his union with God and often, too, most wonderful in the preternatural character of his works.

THE MYSTIC LIFE BASED UPON THE ORDINARY CHRISTIAN LIFE.

It stands to reason, however, that no member of the Church can ever attain to the perfection of this life of the Catholic mystic, whose mysticism is not based upon the excellence of the ordinary Christian life. There is no such thing as a Catholic mystic in whom there is not a perfect devotion to all the teachings of faith, an exceptionally devout use of the sacraments, great zeal for divine worship, an uninterrupted practice of prayer and the fulfillment of the whole law of Christ. For faith is not judged by visions, but the character of visions is determined by the infallible truth of faith. The marvels wrought at the touch or at the prayer of the sublimest mystic will never constitute a criterion of morality; but the moral character as well of his works as of the mystic himself is to be ever judged by the unimpeachable data of the Church's moral and ascetic law. Not indeed that it is impossible or that in very many instances much light has not come into the Church through the words and works of her mystical favorites, nor that we do not possess from these same sources moral and dogmatic information which we could ill do without, but because a mystical career in the Catholic Church is not gauged so much by the marvels and revelations which distinguish it as by the holiness of

life underlying it. For man attains to the mystic state through a complete abnegation of himself, through the cultivation of retirement, by fasting, by a general trampling under foot of the desires of the flesh. But more especially does he attain to this state by the practice of humility, penance and mortification. Mortification in the sense of a progressive purgation of the soul from the dross of inordinate affections is absolutely necessary to the mystic life. It is a preparation for this life and it is a result of it. The soul in the hands of God is more and more disposed for newer and greater graces by the purification which it receives through the practice of mortification. These added graces in their turn induce a loftier spirit and a more cleansing labor of mortification. So that the further a mystic advances towards the spirit world the further he recedes from the material world and becomes alienated even from himself. The higher, therefore, the mystic is raised by the practice of contemplation up towards God, the more he is alienated by the purging force of his mortification from all things and even from himself until, finally, dead to himself, he lives united to God alone in that sublime intercourse to which the mystic writers have given the name of spiritual marriage.

TRUE MYSTICISM FOUNDED IN ABNEGATION.

This sublime form of Christian abnegation we find exercised under divers forms and in many degrees in the history of Catholic mysticism. These in turn depend upon many and various causes. Individual character, the circumstances of the mystic's life, the spirit of the times, the influence of public events, in a word, the destiny of each particular mystic will largely influence his spirit and his practice of abnegation. Hence no two mystics are alike. No two ages of mysticism in the Church are alike. Yet divine mysticism at every period in the Church's life is built, as upon its only foundations, upon this purification or purgation of the soul. This purification is twofold, active and passive, and both the one and the other is requisite for the life of divine contemplation. For as precious ointment, to use the language of the mystical writers, is not poured into unclean vessels, so, too, heavenly consolation, that celestial balsam of the soul, is not poured into a soul defiled by sin or unfit for an intimate union with God by reason of the multitude of its defects. Everything must be removed that might displease the divine Spouse of the soul. The first labor, therefore, of the mystic is to pluck out of his heart every inordinate affection or esteem for country, relatives, friends, pleasures, pastimes, conveniences, riches, means, dignities, honors and to convert the same into a veritable hatred of all these things. By a constant internal

and external mortification he must aim to eradicate all his passions and perverse inclinations. By retirement and a strict custody over his senses he must study to preserve himself in an internal and external solitude, in which alone God will speak to his soul. All these pious endeavors—holy mortifications, devout arts and spiritual solicitudes—by which the soul strives with the aid of God's grace to reform her mind, her body, her heart and her whole sensitive appetite, and thus render herself fit for the contemplation of heavenly things, is the first or active purgation or purification of the soul required for the life of contemplation. It is so necessary to the mystical life that without it there is no immediate union with God through divine contemplation possible in any degree whatever.

But alone this active purgation is insufficient. Over and above the soul's active efforts at fitting herself for a life of contemplation there must be the work of God Himself in the soul, further disposing it for this intimate union of the spiritual life. This work is effected by what the mystical theologians term the passive purgation of the soul. This passive purgation of the soul consists in the complex mass of those awful drynesses, fearful temptations and other internal and external tribulations which God in the exercise of His peculiar providence over mystic souls sends upon those whom He has destined for this exalted state, in order that by this violent ordeal the rebellious appetites may be subjected to the perfect control of reason, and that vicious and imperfect habits may be so completely corrected that the soul is eventually toned and tempered to the sublime action of celestial contemplation. For as the imperfect soul, before it is admitted to the beatific vision, must pass through the flames of Purgatory that it may be purged from the slightest dross, so, too, must the soul of the mystic pass through these passive purifications before it is capable of enjoying the contemplative vision of God. As Chancellor Gerson describes it, this purgation of the soul is "a whetstone that sharpens the iron. It is the absinthe which weans the child from the breast. It is the hammer which enlarges and broadens. It is the file which smooths, cleanses, brightens. It is the furnace in which the gold is refined until it glitters." And this passive purgation or refining of the soul is twofold, a purifying of the senses and a purifying of the spirit. The former is the sum of those sensitive afflictions which by subduing the sensitive appetite and reducing it to the servitude of the spirit produce that peace and quiet in which the soul of the mystic is raised gently, sweetly, gradually up to the contemplation of God. The latter is the sum of those spiritual trials which by rendering the soul as nearly like God as human frailty will permit beget that detachment and purity which dispose

the soul to the union of divine converse and to her transformation into God through the exercise of the contemplative life. In this purgative preparation and the consequent union of the soul with God we possess the perfect expression of divine, of Catholic mysticism. For the substantial definition of this life is such a union of man with God that the soul, so to speak, feels, touches His presence in her. This experimental sense of the presence of God, to use the phraseology of the mystical doctors, produces in its turn an ineffable joy in the soul which may be, and often is, accompanied by the external phenomena of ecstasies, raptures, visions, prophecies and miracles, although the possession of these preternatural powers is not to be confounded with the mystic life itself, inasmuch as it is separable from it and does not always accompany it.

JAMES J. CONWAY, S. J.

St. Louis, Mo.

THE LEGEND OF ST. OLAF, OF NORWAY.

OLAF,¹ Crassus as he was nicknamed, the bold Viking called by Carlyle "the Christian Reform King," because of his zeal for Christianity, the patron saint of Norway, was never formally canonized, though he is mentioned in the Roman Martyrology on July 29, the day of his death.

He was the son of Harold Guenlandus, King of Norway, and Asta, daughter of Gudbrand, and was born in 995, shortly after his father's death. Harold, though the father of a saint, was by no means a saint himself. After his marriage with Asta, who appears to have been beneath him in rank, he fell in love with the young and beautiful Sigrída, Empress of Sweden and daughter of Tosti, with whom Harold stayed five winters. By some writers Sigrída is said to have been Harold's foster-sister. However this may have been, Harold became deeply enamored of her, and begged her on one occasion to marry him in spite of Asta being alive. The scene took place on horseback, and Sigrída told him indignantly that he already had one wife, Asta, who although not his equal in birth, was the best wife for him, and having thus delivered herself she rode away from her disconsolate lover.

Harold persisted in his suit and followed her, but fell a victim to his unlawful passion, for Sigrída, determined to get rid of him,

¹ This account of St. Olaf, unless otherwise stated, is taken from the "Scripta Historica Islandarum," a Latin translation of the Icelandic Saga.

ordered the house in which he and Vivaldus, another King whom he had met, were sleeping, to be set on fire, and as they tried to escape they were slain.

Harold had a friend named Ranius, who was not in Sweden at the time, but we are told that news traveled very quickly in those days, and he soon heard of his sovereign's murder and broke the news to Asta, who seems to have been more concerned at her husband's infidelity than at his death, for she returned very angry to her father's house.

It appears that some time before this Ranius had a dream, in which a former King, Olaf Geierstaid, appeared to him and told him to open his tomb and take out of it his sword, Besingus, his mantle, ring and girdle, and when the child Asta was expecting was about to be born to give her the girdle; and the child was to be called Olaf and to have the sword. The apparition warned Ranius not to be afraid to perform this ghastly task, for if he were, great trouble would come to him; on the other hand, if he did it, the child would live to be a great King. Ranius thereupon plucked up his courage and opened the coffin and took out the mantle, ring, sword and girdle. Then when Asta was taken ill he gave her the girdle to wear, and as soon as the child was born sprinkled him with water, after the heathen custom then in vogue, and named him Olaf.

Gudbrand, the boy's grandfather, was at first unwilling to bring him up because of the odium Harold had incurred by his affair with Sigrida, but when Ranius declared he had seen a light shining over the house when the child was born, he consented to keep him, and eventually brought him up with love and care.

Many anecdotes are given in the Icelandic Saga, from which this account of him is derived, of Olaf's youthful precocity, and as they throw also a light on the manners and customs of the age, and are considered reliable, we shall relate the most striking of them.

When Olaf was about six years old Asta, his mother, had two suitors. One was Sigurdus Porca, King of the Ringariki, and the other a prefect named Gissur. Asta, who does not seem to have cared inordinately for either, took the child on her lap one day and asked him which of the two she should choose. At first Olaf said the one who smiled most when he played with little children; but when Asta told him she was sure he could answer better than that, he displayed more sagacity and asked a pertinent question, namely, was his mother ambitious?

Asta replied that "she is not wanting in ambition," and the boy then asked if she would rather have a son a prefect or a King of Norway, for Ranius had taught him that only those of royal birth

can ascend the Norwegian throne. And finally it was decided that Asta should marry Sigurd, and the marriage turned out a very happy one apparently, from the glimpses we get of their married life.

Olaf was still quite a child when Olaf Trignesson, who had succeeded his father Harold on the throne of Norway, came to stay with Sigurd at Ringarikum. Now Olaf Trignesson was not only an excellent King, but he was also a Christian and had introduced Christianity into Norway and other lands and converted most of his subjects. While at Ringarikum he baptized Sigurd, Asta, Olaf and all the household and stood godfather to Olaf.

When Olaf was about eight he one day saw something bright shining in a box and asked his mother what it was. She told him it was the sword Besingus which Ranius had given him at his birth. Childlike Olaf asked to have it, and Asta rather foolishly gave it to him, whereupon the boy began to play with it. Presently Sigurd, who was a very domestic man and of an economical disposition, came in and was annoyed to see this sword, which we are told was a very handsome one and much decorated, trailing on the ground after the child. He blamed Asta and told her it was exactly like a woman to indulge a child in things it wants least and refuse it things it really wants. Wherefrom we gather that Sigurdus Porca entertained no very high opinion of the wisdom of women, and moreover was a very shrewd man. Asta answers that if Sigurd can take away the sword without making the child cry he can do so, but she won't have the boy cry. Sigurd temporizes, and asks if Olaf will give him Besingus in exchange for a lighter sword. Olaf is silent. Sigurd repeats his question. Olaf remains silent. Sigurd asks a third time, and the boy still refusing to speak, he not unnaturally gets impatient, and is about to force him to give up Besingus, when Olaf draws the sword, throws the shield to Ranius, and stretching out the point of the sword to the King, said:

"I am not of an age to prohibit, but I invite you to snatch Besingus from me, for I give it to no one unless I retain the shield and the handle." Upon which Sigurd tells him to keep the sword, as it would not have been easy to compel him to give it up.

The delightfully natural touches in the description of this little domestic scene vouch for its truth. We can see the fond mother who won't have her boy made to cry, the sensible stepfather and the high-spirited but precocious child. The Saga gives another anecdote of Olaf's youth which is generally quoted by all his biographers, though it seems to us to have less point in it than the sword story. It seems that Sigurd, who was very rich and also very prudent, acted as his own steward and farmed his lands and

overlooked everything himself, King though he was. One day he wished to ride, and no one at home being unoccupied, he ordered Olaf to saddle his horse for him. When the horse ought to have been ready Sigurd went out and blamed Olaf because he ought to have saddled the horse, and said "it was clear he was willing to refuse commands that did not please him, and it appeared they were unlike in disposition, and that Olaf was of a more vehement nature than he." Olaf said little, but went out and saddled a goat for the King.

Another time when Olaf was ten Sigurd invited a number of guests to a feast, and told his stepson to see that the necessary things were prepared. Olaf ordered² some sheep to be killed and invited double the number of guests Sigurd had commanded, and when the King remonstrated with him he answered "that Kings ought to live otherwise than vile peasants," from which stories we gather the boy had a great idea of his own dignity and very regal notions on the duty of hospitality.

It is said that in his youth the boy was beautiful in face. He was of middle size, not tall; stout and thick-set; hence his nickname of Crassus. His limbs were compact and robust; his hair was chestnut, his face broad and rosy; his eyes were wonderful, clear and beautiful, and when angry he was formidable to look at. He was for the days in which he lived very accomplished. He was a dexterous archer, a good swimmer, a fine speaker; his judgment was excellent, his observation acute; he did everything quickly and wished for his dignity's sake to be first in all games of skill. He was beloved by his friends and relations.

When he was twelve years old he went on board a man-of-war for the first time, his mother deputing Ranius, who had had much experience in piracy, to take charge of him. We are told that even in this first expedition, though Ranius sat at the helm, Olaf commanded the ship and the sailors called him King. This was the beginning of Olaf's wild life of a Viking. He went first to Denmark, and in the autumn invaded Sweden. He wintered in Gothland and imposed tribute on the people. Then he laid waste Finland, fought in Friesland, Sudoika and the Island of Oeset, and the following autumn went to England, where he took part in battles with the Danes and Anglo-Saxons.

He spent several years in England. He was present at the battle of Kingmer in 1010 and at the storming of Canterbury in 1012, and he took part with King Ethelred in many battles against the Vikings. In the autumn of the year he first visited England King Sweyn was found dead in his bed, whereupon Ethelred, who was

² The Saga says "a family of sheep."

in Flanders, immediately returned to England, and it was then that Olaf assisted him in a war against Denmark and remained with him three years as commander of the English army till 1012, when Ethelred died. Olaf then went to Normandy, and from thence to Gibraltar, where he had a vision, in which "a man of angelic and formidable presence appeared to him and told him to return to Norway and he should be King there forever." Olaf took this to mean that he and his posterity should occupy the Norwegian throne, and instead of going further, he obeyed the command and returned to Norway, and from this time appears to have abandoned his wild piratical life and devoted himself to extirpating heresy and paganism and establishing Christianity in his kingdom.

Before we proceed to the very interesting account given in the Saga of his return to Norway we will quote some of the legends of his career as a Viking. When he was near the Baltic Sea his companions heard there was a certain prophetess in the place whom they desired to consult, so they asked Olaf if they might question her about his fortune. He said, "No." They then asked if they might question her in his name. This time he did not refuse permission, though he did not wish them to do it. So they consulted her and asked her how long he would be victorious, or if his death was near? She replied, "she saw rays of terror standnig above him, against which it was not granted her to look;" but she added: "Tell the King the day he falls in word in life, that same day his life will be laid down."

Another time when in England Olaf is said to have visited a hermit, whose name is unfortunately not given, who prophesied that he would occupy the Norwegian throne and wear the martyr's crown, both of which prophesies were, as we shall see, in a certain way fulfilled.

Once when fighting some pagans, after he had conquered many and taken a great deal of plunder, the soldiers on bringing the spoils to the ship sought the King, but could not find him. The whole army was in great grief at his loss and did not know what to do. While they were pondering over what steps to take to find him, they saw him dismounted on the ground and a number of men bearing heavy burdens on their backs pleading before him. When the soldiers had carried all these men to the ship and got them on board, they asked them why they, who were so many, suffered themselves to be taken prisoners by one man? The prisoners answered "that Olaf was not alone; they saw with him a great number of armed men, who forced them to bear these heavy burdens." The soldiers, knowing that the King was alone, won-

dered exceedingly, and from that time venerated Olaf with great praise.

Many tales are told of Olaf's adventures with his sword Besingus. On one occasion he was left alone on shore, when he heard a fearful noise from some trees, and presently an enormous wild boar appeared, "followed by such a number of boars that the place seemed filled with them." The big boar attacked Olaf, who was on horseback, but he drew both of his feet up onto his saddle. The boar put its muzzle on to the cloth with which the saddle was covered, and the King swung Besingus and cut off the boar's muzzle below the eyes. The boar still contrived to roar, making a greater noise than Olaf ever heard, but finally succumbed, and Olaf took his muzzle and teeth as a trophy. History is silent as to the part played by the other wild boars in this scene. Perhaps they ran away, or were the offspring of the King's imagination; but that he killed one with Besingus in the way described is most probable.

As Olaf landed in Norway he fell and remarked: "The King falls." "No," said Ranius, "he does not fall; he sets his foot firmly in the soil," and Olaf laughed and took it as a good omen. He went home first to his mother Asta and his stepfather Sigurd at Ringarikum, and Asta's preparations for receiving her son with due honor, after his long absence and victorious career, are very naively described. She commanded all her servants, men and women, to set the house in the best order and divided the tasks among them in couples. Two were set to strew the floors with fresh straw, for there were no carpets in Europe in those days; two were sent to place the wine bowls on the sideboard, two to set the table, two to place dishes upon it, two to fetch beer from the cellar; two were sent to Sigurd, who when the news of Olaf's coming arrived was out in the fields. These two carried him royal apparel and a saddle inlaid with gold and a bridle set with precious stones, that he might be suitably appareled, according to Asta's ideas, to do honor to her son. We are expressly told she was a liberal, large-minded woman, and we gather incidentally that she was exceedingly proud of Olaf and very ambitious for him, and certainly did not intend Sigurd to receive him in his every-day clothes. The Saga describes Sigurd's dress as he appeared to meet his stepson. He wore a blue tunic, blue stockings reaching high up his thighs, a wide mantle of bluish gray fur; in his hand he carried a stick upright with a large silver ring on the top, which seems to have been doing duty for a sceptre.

During Olaf's stay at Ringarikum Sigurd, whose economy constantly peeps out, gave Olaf's soldiers milk and beer on alternate

days. This did not please the men, and they complained to Olaf, who told them Sigurd did it out of prudence, because milk was better than beer for wounded men. On the feast of Jolensus a banquet appears to have been given in Olaf's honor, and his mother placed him on a splendid high throne, and when Sigurd entered with his court in gala dress, a scarlet mantle covering him, he saluted his stepson lovingly and invited him to stay with him as long as he liked. He then sat next him, and they talked and took wine together and were very happy. Presently Asta brought in her baby, Sigurd's son, and put him on to Olaf's lap and asked him "whether he saw any talent hidden in the child." Olaf replied cautiously "that if the infant was permitted to live his life would not be a foolish one." This child was Harold, afterwards King of Norway.

Sigurd at first was not inclined to help Olaf to be King, and prophesied opposition from the Danish and Swedish Kings, which prophecy in the sequel proved true; but Asta took Olaf's part so warmly that Sigurd withdrew his opposition, and Olaf was proclaimed King, first of part of Norway, eventually, in 1014, of the whole country.

There seems to be some doubt about the date of Olaf's visit to Canute in England, but apparently it took place before this return to Norway, according to the Saga, which says Canute invaded England in 1012, and that Ranius was sent by Olaf to bribe the people to receive him, and that the next winter he himself landed in Northumberland and remained in England till he went to Normandy. Maurer says that when Canute was in England, in 1013-1014, Olaf was Ethelred's servant and Canute's enemy, and that therefore he could not have stayed with him then; but the Saga places Ethelred's death in 1012, so it seems most likely it was after that date that Olaf remained as Canute's guest till he went to Normandy.

Canute, afterwards his enemy, appears from several anecdotes always to have been jealous of Olaf and to have envied him. It was Olaf's custom to go to Mass when the bell summoned the people, and to be present till the end of the service; and the Saga quaintly adds: "No matter how much noise nor what disturbance went on outside the church, Olaf never looked out, but persevered in prayer, nothing moved by fear." But when Canute assisted at Mass it was his custom that they should wait for his coming before beginning, and he seems to have had no scruples about delaying the service.

On a certain feast day Canute was expected, and after they had been waiting for him a long time the Bishop, seeing Olaf in church,

blamed Canute and said: "In the evening King Canute will come, but we shall wait no longer for him, for this King Olaf is now here, who is of pure soul and loves the Divine Office." When Canute arrived and heard what the Bishop had said he was angry and envied Olaf and, in the words of the Saga, "could not look at him with straight eyes." He told the Bishop, who is believed to have called Olaf King for the first time, by a supernatural instinct, that Olaf had no kingdom and was no better than he was and no stricter in food and dress. The Bishop replied that Olaf wore haircloth under his beautiful clothes and drank water when Canute thought he was drinking wine.⁸

That Olaf was strict with himself is proved by another incident. He is said to have been cutting wood one Sunday, forgetting what the day was, and when reminded he burnt the shavings on his bare hand to punish himself.

He had many enemies, among them one Rerekus, King of Uppland, whom some writers say Olaf had blinded because of his heresy, for he was very severe in putting down heresy and paganism. At any rate Rerekus was blind, and several times attempted to kill Olaf. Once on Ascension day during Mass, both Kings being present, the Bishop having conducted Olaf with great pomp round the church to his seat in the north part of the choir, Kerekus, who was sitting by the King, took hold of his arm, pressing the armpit to find out if he had on a coat-of-mail, and remarked that he was wearing silk, and inquired why he did so. Olaf replied that it was the feast of the Ascension of Our Lord. When Mass began Olaf stood up and holding his hand over his eyes bowed towards the altar so that his toga was thrown back from his shoulders. Suddenly Rerekus pierced him with a dagger, but though he cut his clothes he did not wound him, the folds of his toga saving him. As he felt the iron seeking him he threw himself on the ground and Rerekus struck again, but failing to wound his enemy thought the King had fled and said: "Thou fleest from the blind, Olaf Crassus." Olaf commanded his followers to take Rerekus out of the church. They obeyed and afterwards begged Olaf to put Rerekus to death for his treacherous conduct. Olaf refused to put do this, but he sent Rerekus to Iceland, where three years later he died and was buried and is the only King buried in that island.

In 1018 Olaf's stepfather, Sigurd Porca, died, and about this time Olaf was betrothed to Ingigerda, daughter of another Olaf, King of Sweden. The two Olafs had been fighting for some time, and though it was not a regular war, there had been many skirmishes between them, and when Olaf Crassus offered to make peace

⁸ Mauser's "Bekehrung der Norwegischen Stammen."

with him the Swedish Olaf promised to give him his daughter Ingigerda in marriage.

At the appointed time Olaf Crassus set out to the place fixed upon to celebrate the marriage, but on arrival found no bride, no King Olaf to meet him and no legates. Our Olaf spent a great part of the summer in Sweden and sent to know the meaning of this conduct, and eventually discovered that the King of Sweden had broken his promise and given his daughter to Jarostad, King of Russia, instead. Ingigerda, it seems, was very anxious to marry Olaf, but her father told her nothing would induce him to consent to her marriage with Olaf Crassus, whose nickname displeased him and who had conquered him in their recent quarrel.

Olaf Crassus was naturally very angry at this breach of faith, and was going to war with Sweden, when Bognavaudus, Prince of Gotha, suggested that Olaf should marry Astrida, the Swedish King's illegitimate daughter, instead, and brought her to Norway for Olaf to see. There were several interviews and long colloquies between the pair, but Olaf was very obstinate, and for a long time refused to be put off with Astrida, when he had been promised Ingigerda. At last Astrida, who appears to have been a very capable young woman, tells him it is wrong to make war for Ingigerda when he can have her without any fighting, and in the end Olaf yields and is married to Astrida in 1019.

After his marriage he appears to have labored more assiduously than ever for the Church, and introduced Christianity into many provinces. He was most zealous in propagating the faith, and is said to have used very drastic methods of conversion, and to have stamped out heathenism with great severity. The people whom Olaf Trignesson had originally converted were constantly reverting to paganism, and this Olaf Crassus punished with great strictness; but his one thought was the glory of God and the spread of Christianity. He often checked his own will to do God's will, and he cared more for God's will than for the opinion of good men or for his position with his people.

Maurer says that "as long as he lived there were different reports about him. Some said he was obstinate, haughty, mean, revengeful, avaricious, passionate and a man of the world. Others who knew better called him gentle, humble, kind, of a good disposition, mild, good humored, wise; a good friend, faithful and true, generous, modest, silent, one who always kept his word and was obedient to God's laws. And these were right." This testimony from Maurer, who is inclined to belittle Olaf, is more valuable than the praises of the sagas and scalds, for the very reason that the German historian is disposed to dispute his claims to sanctity, in estimating

which we must remember the rough time in which he lived and the wild piratical life the old Vikings led.

However, there seems little doubt that, as Maurer says, Olaf's subjects, rich and poor, were disaffected mostly because of his strictness and severity in putting down heresy and idolatry, so that when Canute came to Norway to set Hakon Ericson on the throne and Hardicanute on the Danish throne, he did not find much difficulty in bribing Olaf's people to join him. Ormund, King of Sweden, helped Olaf with troops, and in 1025 an alliance was concluded between them against Canute and preparations for war were made.

The year before this Olaf's son, Magnus, who succeeded him as King of Norway, was born. It is said he was not the son of Astrida, but an illegitimate child. His mother was a beautiful girl of royal birth named Alfhildis.

In 1027 he was repulsed by Canute, and being warned of the perfidy of some of his subjects he fled to Sweden and Russia, but returned to Norway in 1029. Then occurred an incident which shows how zealous he was for the Catholic religion. Nine hundred Norwegians offered to join him, but they were heathen, and he refused to enlist them as his soldiers unless they were baptized first. Four hundred consented and were baptized; the other five hundred refused and left. He is said to have had altogether 3,600 men, all of whom wore a white cross on their helmets, and their battle-cry was: "Forwards! Forwards! Christ's people, Cross people, King's men."

Four Icelandic scalds went among the troops, relating the incidents of the battle in verse. A fifth was absent on a pilgrimage, which afforded the other scalds opportunities of girding at him, which they never neglected.

The night before the battle of Stiklastad, in which he was slain, Olaf passed a long time in prayer and watching, and in the morning he called his army to go to confession and hear Mass, at which all communicated, after which, as the enemy had not appeared, Olaf fell asleep and had a dream, in which he thought he was standing on the top of a ladder, and just as he was about to enter heaven he was awakened by one of his generals with the news that the enemy was close upon them.

There was an eclipse of the sun that day, and from half-past two to three it was perfectly dark. Olaf was slain before then. He was wounded in three places, but he fought most bravely. His sword was blunted and would not cut, and after his second wound, dealt him by Thorer Hund, he threw away his sword and prayed to God to help him. Thorer wounded him a third time and he fell,

and all his followers were slain with him. Olaf was thirty-five at this time.

After the battle was over Thorer went to the body and straightened it and covered it with a cloak. When he washed the blood from the face it was as beautiful as when Olaf lived; the color in his cheeks was as bright as ever. Some of the blood fell on Thorer's fingers, where he had himself been wounded, and suddenly they were healed and needed no bandage, as Thorer himself declared openly as a proof of Olaf's sanctity, to which his enemies were the first to bear witness. In this battle Harold, his half-brother, Sigurd Porca's son, who was then only fifteen, was seriously wounded.

The Saga relates another miracle which was worked by Olaf immediately after his death. That same evening Thorgil Alma and his son Grim took the late King's body and carried it to some little distance from the town of Stiklastad and hid it in a small empty hut lest the enemy, and especially Thorer, should steal it. They washed it, wrapped it in a linen shroud and built up a heap of stones to conceal it, and then went back to the town to arrange for its burial. Presently a number of beggars who were following the army went round the town begging for food, and among them was a certain blind man led by a boy, who came to this hut, the entrance to which was so low that they could only enter by stooping. The blind man went in, stretching out his hands on all sides, searching for what he could find. Presently he felt something moist on the ground and accidentally touched his eyes with his hands. Then, saying no one could sleep in such a damp place, he went out and, to his amazement, saw his hands, and by degrees his sight came back entirely and he went to the town telling the people the damp from the hut had healed his eyes and restored his sight.

Thorgil and his son, hearing the report, guessed what had happened, and fearing Thorer, who they also knew was searching for the body, should find it, they took it away and hid it in a field. They then made a coffin and placed the corpse in it. Thorgil then bought a swift sailing vessel and taking seven or eight friends as a crew put the body on board and in the evening sailed for Nidarosa, which was about twelve miles distant.

On arriving at Nidarosa Thorgil sent to tell the Bishop, named Sigurd, that he had brought the late King's body from Stiklastad. Sigurd sent men to the ship to fetch it, and it was taken ashore, placed in an empty house and watched all night and buried before dawn, when Thorgil and his men returned to the ship and went back.

Olaf's body was afterwards moved to the Cathedral at Drontheim,

or Trondhem, which is still dedicated to him, though rebuilt in 1712. His cultus began immediately after his death. He was at once invoked and honored as a saint and is still regarded as the patron saint of Norway. He was admitted into the Roman Martyrology because he was killed in a war excited by his zeal in promoting the Catholic religion. He is honored on the day of his death, July 29. His fame spread to Germany as well as to Sweden and Denmark, where he is venerated, and in pre-Reformation days he was a very popular saint in England, where many churches, some still existing, were dedicated to him.⁴

In London four churches were dedicated to him—one in Old Jewry; one in Silver street, which was destroyed in the great fire of London; one in Southwark, and one to St. Olaf and St. Nicholas in Hart street. A modern church has been dedicated to him in Hanbury street, Mile End, and one at Stoke Newington. There is a St. Olave's in Chichester, one in Exeter, one at Marygate, York; one at Chester, one at Shipton-Oliffe, Gloucestershire; one at Fritwell, in Oxfordshire, and several near the coast; one in the Isle of Wight, at Gatcombe; one at Poryhill, Cornwall; one at Ruckland, Lincolnshire. The Church of Creeting, St. Olaf's, Suffolk, no longer exists. Herringfleet Priory, Norfolk, was dedicated to Our Lady and St. Olave, as the saint was more often called in this country.

Olaf was credited with working miracles in his lifetime as well as after his death, but the people were very superstitious and ignorant and ready to attribute anything they did not understand to a supernatural source. He was very generous to the Church and very charitable. He supported many widows and orphans, consoled the afflicted, advised and helped those in need. On the other hand, he was hard with his soldiers and punished thieves severely; but though he was very strict in avenging sins against God, he forgave all offenses against himself.

The story of the conversion of the people of Gudbrandsdate, which is told in most of the lives and legends of St. Olaf, throws a light on his character and shows the methods he had recourse to in dealing with idolaters. These people worshiped a great image of Thor, and Gudbrand, the chief man of the valley, at a meeting between him and Olaf said that if Olaf's God would make the next day fine he and his followers would meet the King and his men and bring their image with them and discuss the question which was the true God.

The next morning Olaf went to Mass, and the day being fine

⁴ "Studies in Church Dedications," by Miss Arnold Forster, and Ecton's "Thesaurus."

afterwards to the council with Gudbrand, who then agreed if the next day were also fine he would either accept Christianity or fight. Olaf told his men to bore holes in the night in Gudbrand's ships, and to let loose all his horses, so that he and his followers could not escape by land or water. He then ordered a man named Kolbein to stand behind him with a battle-axe and to do exactly as he told him when the council took place. Presently Gudbrand and his men arrived, and bringing into a field the huge idol, which was decorated with jewels and precious stones, bowed down before it. Then he and his people congregated together on one side of the image, and King Olaf and his men on the other side of it. Olaf then told Kolbein when the idolaters were looking the other way to strike the image with all his might with his axe.

As the sun rose Olaf called out to Gudbrand: "Look to the east. Behold our God," and when the Gudbranders turned to look at the rising sun Kolbein struck the idol, and battering it open, out ran a quantity of rats, mice and other vermin; whereupon Gudbrand's people, who were mostly farmers, fled, but as their ships were scuttled and their horses lost they could not escape. Olaf then gave them their choice of fighting or of accepting Christianity. They sulkily submitted and were baptized, and the King told them to pick up the jewels with which they had decorated the idol and give them to their wives and daughters.

Another story of Olaf and Thor is told by Carlyle in his "Lectures on Heroes." Olaf was sailing from place to place along the Norwegian coast when one day a stranger, tall and robust, with a red beard and grave aspect, stepped on board, and after a while is brought by the courtiers to the King. The conversation appears to have turned on the beauty of the scenery, when the stranger made the following remarkable speech: "Yes, King Olaf, it is all beautiful, with the sun shining on it; green, fruitful, a fair home for you, and many a sore time had Thor, and many a wild fight with the Jotuns before he could make it so. And now you seem minded to do away with Thor; but have a care, King Olaf." And, frowning, the stranger, who was no less than the mighty Thor himself, disappeared and was never seen again in this world; which, we take it, is a highly picturesque way of describing Olaf's extermination of paganism. Perhaps we cannot do better than close this sketch of the great Norwegian saint's career with this dramatic exit of Thor, the pagan god, whom Olaf dethroned and whose cultus he abolished.

DARLEY DALE.

Gloucestershire, England.

CZAR NICHOLAS I. AND THE HOLY SEE (1825-1855).

THE evil policy of Catharine II., temporarily or partially arrested in the reigns of the Emperors Paul and Alexander, was consolidated and rounded out by her grandson, Nicholas. In the annals of modern persecution he holds a unique and ominous place. During most of his reign circumstances made him the dominant factor in continental politics, and he used this prestige to perfect certain traditional purposes of the Muscovite state, prominent among which was the thorough crushing of all Western influence and spirit, preparatory to the assertion of Holy Russia as the heir of Byzantine autocracy, the regenerator of Christendom and the mistress of the Orient.

"His dream," says an accurate historian of Russian Catholicism, "was that of all despots who are conscious of their power and accept unhesitatingly their allotted role, however fatal its ending. The realization of a triple unity, religious, political and national, throughout an immense empire that contained every variety of worship, government and climate; the establishment by every and any means of an unnatural unity similar to that which the Russian uniform stamps upon an army made up from twenty races and peoples; the straining in that sense of all the forces of an ultra-centralization that recoiled before no degree of violence or cunning, no succession of failures or defeats—such was the supreme aim of Nicholas I. during the thirty years that Providence tolerated in his hands the iron sceptre that he seemed to have received from Peter the Great himself. His chief obstacle was the Catholic Church, the only power that has at all times and everywhere bid defiance to every despot, however called, and which alone has the certainty of outliving them. Nicholas was to learn this in due time; meanwhile he set about the absolute ruin of the faith of Rome. He would enslave it by cunning regulations, seduce it by deceitful promises, or overwhelm it by the violence of open persecution.¹

The bureaucratic character of the new empire, as established by Peter the Great, permits and assures the permanency and regular operation of any policy once inaugurated in the Russian state. If we consider the undeveloped condition of the Russian commonwealth and the many human sympathies that feed its hopeless corruption; if we add its territorial vastness, the vague terror of a secret and sudden sanction of every absolute command, the universal ignorance and degradation of the popular mind, the skilful intermingling of racial hate, political dreams and religious fanaticism, we shall grasp in a general way the ease and the confidence with which a born autocrat like Nicholas took up the policy of his wicked grandmother and pushed it unhesitatingly to that degree of success which the God of Nations occasionally tolerates for the sublime purposes that are later made known to His children.

We have seen how the unspeakable treason of Siestrenczewicz laid low all the ready and natural opposition of the Russian Cath-

¹ Lescoeur, "*L'Eglise Catholique et le Gouvernement Russe*," Paris, 1903, p. 55.

olic Uniats and kept open all the roads that led to the usual centres of popular resistance to spiritual oppression. For the greater humiliation of Russian Catholicism and of the Holy See, the aged Archbishop of Mohilew disappeared from the scene (1825), only to make way for an even viler character—Joseph Siemaszko. For fifty years Siestrencewicz had drawn from the Russian treasury an annual salary of fifty thousand dollars, together with other perquisites, for which Judas-price he had sold the corner-stone of Catholicism in Russia—its unity with the See of Peter. But Siemaszko was destined to a more wretched fate, that of a public apostasy, entailing the loss of the Ruthenian Catholic hierarchy, such as it then was, and of several millions of Ruthenian Uniats. In the person of Siemaszko was finally consummated one chapter of the patient and crafty policy of Old Muscovy inaugurated on the downfall of Constantinople (1453) and further clarified and consolidated during the reign of Iwan III. (d. 1505).² It was just four hundred years (1439-1839) from the Council of Florence to the supreme treason of Siemaszko, from the creation of ecclesiastical unity by Cardinal Isidore, the metropolitan of Kiew, and his nine suffragans of Little Russia and White Russia, to the lamentable overthrow of the same by the most traitorous of the many traitorous agents of Russian imperial bureaucracy.

Ecclesiastical treason is particularly odious. It is committed on helpless multitudes who have passed away before it dawns upon the world that an irreparable wrong has been committed. For obvious reasons the agent of it is usually immune from personal punishment; such a traitor is a father who betrays his children, a tutor who abandons his wards, an administrator who squanders an estate. Cowardice, selfishness and malice dominate in such a guilty heart, and the sweep of the ruin they involve is commensurate with the dignity and responsibility of the offender.

Joseph Siemaszko was born in the department of Kiew and was ordained a priest in the Catholic Seminary of Wilna. In 1812 he was called to St. Petersburg as assessor in the Catholic College of

² The strongest element of Russian empire is the principle of unity impressed upon it by Iwan III. He created the unity of administration by centering in his own person all sovereign rights; political unity by suppressing the political existence of several provinces and free cities whose distinct forms of government assured a certain degree of independence; religious unity by detaching the Church of Russia from any foreign influence or supremacy and subordinating it to his own will. This triple unity, to which time has added military centralization, fills with its spirit the entire Russian state, and forestalls at every turn the development of any power or influence calculated to weaken it. It is this fundamental Russian unity, the work of Iwan III., that has been for four centuries the source of all Russian governmental action.—Pitziplos, *L'Eglise Orientale* Rome, II.—III., p. 67.

the Russian Uniat. The advent of Nicholas opened a way to the ambition of the young Siemaszko. In 1827 he laid before the new Czar a plan for the abolition of the Units or Ruthenians. Nothing could have been more welcome; it took up the secret suggestions made by Siestrenczewicz in 1806, and was itself surrounded with deep secrecy until the accomplishment of its nefarious aims.³

He began by recalling the express intention of Catharine II. to extirpate the Russian Uniat in the conquered provinces. But after her death the local authorities relaxed their vigilance, and even looked with favor on the Uniat clergy. An ukase of 1800 treats the Uniats as Roman Catholics, and places them under the direction of the Catholic College at St. Petersburg, than which nothing could have been more disastrous, especially as in 1798 their dioceses had been reëstablished in Lithuania,⁴ since which date no more Uniat parishes returned to the State Church.

What are the causes of this reaction among the Uniats? Siemaszko answers that it is partly owing to the influence of the proprietors of the soil—they are mostly converts to the Latin rite, while their dependent serfs continue in the ancestral Greek rite. The Uniat clergy sympathize with their benefactors, the Latin landlords. Moreover, the dispossessed Greek Uniat priests continue to enjoy in their parishes the protection of the Polish proprietor; Greek Uniat priests attend in Latin chapels and churches and even act as curates in the Latin parishes. *Even orthodox Russian parishes quit the State Church occasionally and join the Uniat body.*⁵ As many as forty-four had thus gone over in the department of Minsk.

Entire parishes of the Greek Uniats had gone over to the Latin rite in White Russia and in Lithuania; similarly numerous families and individuals. He did not add that this was done in the hope of preserving their faith and escaping a formal apostasy to the State Church. Siemaszko goes on to insist on the simultaneous education of the youth of both rites in the same seminaries. At the same time the wealth and the social position of the Latin clergy

³ The details of this plan were later made known by the Russian priest Marochkine. Cf. Fr. Martinoff, S. J., "Le plan d'abolition de l'église grecque unie," in *Etudes Religieuses*, Paris, 1873.

⁴ By the Bull "Maximis undique pressi," dated from the Chartreuse of Florence, Pius VI., in accord with Paul I., had reëstablished three Uniat dioceses—Luck, Kamientec and Minsk.

⁵ Count Tolstol is convicted of mendacity by this secret admission of Siemaszko, which he must certainly have read before he wrote ("Le Catholicisme Romain en Russie," Paris, 1864) that the Uniat (Ruthenian) Church had been created by violence, and was sustained by artifice and intrigue. Similarly a formal lle of Catharine II. to Pius VI. (November 4, 1782) is exposed by Père Lescoeur, *op. cit.*, p. 59.

react strongly upon the Greek Uniat clergy. Had time been granted to the Empress Catharine, she would have completely abolished the independence of the Ruthenians.⁶

When Catharine tardily nominated an Archbishop (Litowski) of White Russia he was urged, adds Siemaszko, to obtain from Rome the restoration of the Ruthenian rite as it existed before the Council of Zamosc (1720), *i. e.*, the abolition of the commemoration of the Pope at the Mass and of the Filioque in the creed. What would be her attitude, he argued, now, when the clergy of White Russia and Little Russia no longer conceals its preference for Latinism?⁷

In order to check the growth of Catholicism among the Russian Uniats Siemaszko proposed to the Czar the following measures: First, the creation of a special ecclesiastical tribunal for the Uniats, with the view of checking any additions to their rite and of compelling the exact observance of its ancient elements. This was aimed at the feasts and devotions with which the Ruthenian worship had been enriched since the sixteenth century, through contact with Catholicism. Second, the diminution in number and the territorial extension of the Uniat dioceses, and the nomination to these few vast sees of Bishops thoroughly cognizant of the imperial purpose and willing to execute it, *i. e.*, of traitors to Catholicism. Third, the creation of special schools and seminaries for the Uniats, from which all Latin students and influences should be carefully excluded. Fourth, the diminution of the Basilian convents, and their subjection to the diocesan authorities. As the latter were now to be traitorous agents of Catholicism, this was a double blow at Ruthenian monasticism, hitherto a very strong bulwark of the faith amid the disorder and ruin of the last fifty years. It was this subtle re-casting of the discipline, education and administration of the Ruthenian communities that, as we shall see, finally brought about the almost total extinction of Catholicism among the Uniats. These measures aimed at a gradual but sure segregation of the latter from all spiritual contact with their Latin brethren, at the suppression of all protest on the part of their shepherds, at the official distortion of the theology and history of Catholicism, at the extirpation of all lively piety and ecclesiastical independence

⁶ In spite of her treaties and her protestations of humanity and tolerance, she did abolish in 1795 all the Ruthenian sees with the exception of Polotsk, and established in their place four Russian eparchies or dioceses. We have seen that in 1798 Paul I. restored three of the Ruthenian sees—Polotsk, Lusk and Brzesk—and in 1809 the diocese of Chelm.

⁷ Russian writers usually speak of Catholicism as Latinism; national pride and suspicion are thereby made auxiliaries of systematic distortion and mendacity in matters of religion.

among the clergy, and at the extinction of all ancient habits and customs that could in any way remind the Uniat peasantry of the centre and head of Catholicism.⁸

Had Thomas Cromwell and his descendant, Oliver Cromwell, been gifted with the perspicacity of this priest of "Holy Kiew," what a wreck they might have made of Irish Catholicism! These few large and simple measures, stubbornly carried out in the spirit of the curial advisers of Catharine—Calvinists, Jansenists, Voltairians, Gallicans, Febronians—compassed the spiritual ruin of several millions of innocent Russian peasants, inaugurated a persecution of unexampled tenacity and ferocity, and blasted indefinitely the hopes of ecclesiastical unity that Rome had so long and so tenderly nourished in Lithuania and the Ukraine.

One more useful suggestion was made by Siemaszko—the purchase of consciences at the price of money and honors. Increases of salary, new and special insignia and frequent subventions to the minor clergy are proposed as arguments of an irresistible kind.⁹

II.

By an ukase of April 22, 1828, Nicholas I. called into existence the Greek Uniat College at St. Petersburg, soon to be a mere tool of the Holy Synod for the thorough Russification of the Uniat Catholics. It was a state bureau operating under the name of the now traitorous hierarchy of the Ruthenians, and destined to accomplish in one short decade the plan of Catharine II. In that time it excluded the Ruthenian clergy, secular and regular, from all control of ecclesiastical education, installed lay agents and Protestants in control of ecclesiastical affairs, imposed its arbitrary decisions on the monastic houses in matters of internal government and discipline, kept vacant with set purpose episcopal sees or filled them with aged, weak or morally unfit appointees, confiscated repeatedly the wealth of the monastic houses and suppressed a multitude of them. After the Polish insurrection of 1830 many thousands of Polish children were deported to Russia, all com-

⁸ The Russian liturgy often recognizes the primacy of the Apostolic See, cf. Tondini, "La primauté de St. Pierre prouvée par les titres que lui donne l'église russe dans sa liturgie," Paris, 1867, and Dom Guépin, "Saint Josaphat Kuncewitch, archevêque de Polock, martyr de l'unité catholique et l'église grecque Unie en Pologne," Paris, 1874, c. g. I, 172.

⁹ Lescœur, *op. cit.*, p. 62. On the extensive clerical espionage of Russia, cf. the *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien*, passim; Döllinger, "Kirche und Kirchen" (1861): "The most insignificant priest in Albania, Corfu, Zante, Cephalonia, receives a small subvention from the ecclesiastical treasury of Nischnei-Novgorod." Similarly, he adds, the Slavs of Austria, the Wallachians of Hungary and Transylvania are subject to Russian influence.

munication with Rome was strictly forbidden, the most severe penalties inflicted on any one who converted a Russian subject to Catholicism, Russian legislation on mixed marriages extended to Poland, with the obligation of bringing up in schism all children of such marriages. At the same time no Catholic priest could legally perform such mixed marriages. Many Catholic parishes were suppressed by the renewal of an old law of Catharine to the effect that no parish should consist of less than a hundred families. Catholic priests of Latin rite were strictly forbidden to administer the sacraments to Greek Uniats, and no community of worship was henceforth tolerated between the two rites. Schismatic Russian sees were established in the old Ruthenian (suppressed) sees, many churches taken from the Catholics even in Warsaw, and a total uniformity of rite established (1834) between Greek Uniats and the State Church. In all these measures and many others Siemaszko was the right-hand and willing tool of Nicholas. He had been made Bishop of the Lithuanian Uniats in 1830 by the Czar, and accepted by Gregory XVI., who was, of course, unaware that for three years he had been maturing the evil plan which he was to pursue, step by step, until his death in 1868, and for whose final completion he was to leave behind him others of the same breed.

Thus, in 1831, become president of the Greek Uniat College or bureau, he ordered the withdrawal of the usual missals, rituals and breviaries of the Uniat clergy and replaced them by similar works printed at Moscow by the Holy Synod, but of course without commemoration of the Pope in the Mass or the recitation of the Filioque in the Creed. Any recalcitrant priest was punished by interment in some prison-convent of Russia or even by exile to Siberia, while his wife and children were taken from him and inscribed on the registers of the State Church. The ancient Catholic cathedrals of the Uniats were transformed externally and internally into Russian churches. The nomination of its pastors was taken from the Uniat Church and confided to the provincial governors, who placed in these offices vicious and corrupt men and removed every worthy and independent shepherd. A wretched subterfuge of Catharine was refurbished in order to withdraw many churches from the Uniats—if it appeared from the parish register that the church had been founded by Russian Greeks or had at any time belonged to them, the church was adjudged to the “dominant religion.” Similarly a handful of malicious or disgruntled parishioners could hand over their church to the state-bishop and fix the stigma of legal apostasy on the faithful majority. Conversions to the State Church were paid for at a ruble per head. Schroeder, the Protestant governor of Witepsk, received from

Nicholas thirty-three thousand rubles for as many Uniat souls converted to the Emperor's religion. Ukase upon ukase, treason upon treason, violence and hypocrisy in quick succeeding acts, mark this decade of sorrow and humiliation. Byzantinism and Slavophilism had so worked upon the soul of the Czar that he came to be as it were eaten by a subtle and fierce mysticism of proselytism unequaled in the history of mankind.¹⁰

Bulhak, the aged metropolitan of the Uniats, refused to associate himself with these measures, and heroically bore the reproaches and menaces of the government which awaited impatiently the close of a life that yet withheld the consummation of the Ruthenian apostasy. His funeral, at least, was conducted according to the schismatic rite, and he was laid away among the Russian metropolitans in the cemetery of St. Alexander Newski.

Thereupon took place the formal renunciation of Ruthenian allegiance to the Holy See and the incorporation with the Russian Church of the Uniats of Lithuania and the Ukraine. The Official Gazette of St. Petersburg published in February 12 (24), 1839, the decree of a synod held by Siemaszko, with his creatures, the Bishop of Brezck and the Bishop of White Russia, in which three Judases proclaimed null and void the union of 1595, and requested the Czar to permit their return and that of their flocks to "the Church of their fathers." This momentous step was followed quickly by a series of imperial decrees and corresponding acts of Siemaszko and his fellow-traitors that consummated the quasi-total abolition of Roman unity in Russia. The event was celebrated with public rejoicing, the Russian press proclaimed the extinction of a "barbarous superstition" and protested beforehand against the judgment of history. It insisted on the peaceful nature of a triumph of persuasion and the overflowing joy of all the new converts at their restoration to the Church of their origin, their native tongue and their former faith. A medal was struck with the devise: "Separated through hatred in 1595; reunited through love in 1839." It was in vain that Gregory XVI. protested in an allocution of November 22—the Czar no longer feared or needed him. In the Pope's unhappy letter to the Polish Bishops in 1832, on the morrow of the insurrection, the Russian autocracy had secured from Rome all that then seemed desirable and had seemingly exhausted the

¹⁰ Pere Lescoeur says (*op. cit.*, p. 74) that Nicholas surpassed even Catharine, and interpreted her decrees in a more odious sense than she intended. Every Uniat priest had to choose between the State religion, imprisonment, the galleys or the mines. It was a mercy when only their families were ruined; Siemaszko's own father refused to apostatize, and reproached his son for his criminal deeds. He owed it only to his advanced age that he was not deported to Siberia.

latter's power of retaliation. Secure against revolution at home, foremost in war and diplomacy abroad, striding with rapidity on the roads of India and Constantinople, the new Byzantium seemed really on the point of presenting to the astonished eyes of the Western "barbarians" another Justinian who should scourge their lawlessness, abate their pretensions, and recast human society on the lines laid down by the Holy Synod, or rather by the dark and cruel spirits who work through that horrid puppet.

III.

The sufferings of the Uniat clergy and people in the former Russian provinces of the kingdom of Poland since the advent of Nicholas I. have been so often told, and by such authoritative and eloquent pens, that a fresh recital of them seems unnecessary.¹¹ Suffice it to say that no form of persecution was spared them during his fateful reign. Long and cruel and wantonly distant imprisonment of courageous village priests and Basilian monks who refused to read the new liturgical books, quasi-enslavement under immoral and apostate brethren, confiscation of their small properties, scattering of their families and incorporation of their children with far-away schismatic families, exile to Siberia, frequent scourgings and servile work of specially humiliating character, arbitrary deportation from province to province, enforced ignorance of all outside sympathy, contemptuous betrayal of every appeal to the heart of the "Little Father" of all Russians—what measure of oppression was left untried by the bureaucrats of St. Petersburg and the fanatics of Moscow in the seemingly interminable reign of Nicholas? The cruelties practised on the Ruthenian clergy were repeated with unspeakable severity against the numerous parishes that resisted manfully and openly the power of the Northern Colossus. Several authentic "acts" of these common martyrdoms are extant and cause the pages of Eusebius of Cæsarea and Cyprian of Carthage to

¹¹ The official history, with its (90) "pieces justificatives," is told in the Allocution of Gregory XVI., dated July 22, 1842; cf. "Esposizione documentata sulle costanti cure del Sommo Pontefice Pio IX. a riparo de'mali che soffre la Chiesa Catholica nel dominio di Russia e Polonia," Rome, 1866, pp. 55, with one hundred official documents. Cf. *Civiltà Cattolica*, 1867, vol. IX-X. (sixth series). The facts of Siemaszko's treason and the imperial hypocrisy and violence were revealed to Europe by Theiner in a celebrated (German) work, translated into French under the title of "Vicissitudes de l'Eglise Catholique en Russie," 2 vols., Paris, 1843. Cf. (Horner) "Persecutions et Souffrances de l'Eglise Catholique en Russie," Paris, 1842. The details of the execution of Siemaszko's plan of 1827-29 may be seen in the work of Dom Bérengier, "Les Martyrs Uniates en Pologne," Paris, 1868; cf. Pelesz, "Geschichte der Union der ruthenischen Kirche mit Rom," 1880; Ed. Litowski, "Geschichte des allgemeinen Verfalls der unierten ruthenischen Kirche im 18 und 19 Jahrhundert," Posen, 1885-1887.

pale before these unadorned tales of Russian malice. It may be that a clement and lax execution of rigorous legislation is characteristic of Russian power; if so, the Ruthenians are a certain exception, and their attachment to Rome *the* unpardonable crime of a Russian subject. Who would not be moved to tears by the story of the dragoonings in the villages of Pryzbrodzie (1841), Dudakowitzé (1841-1854), Porozow (1834-1872, Dzirnotwizé (1858)? All resemble one another in their simple and monotonous brutality of injustice. Protestant governors and Russian "popes" enter the Uniat hamlet, seize the church and the notables, burn the villagers' huts, inflict on venerable men and delicate women the cruel torture of the knout, collect and deport the children and depart with threats of a new visitation. At Dudakowitzé the Uniats refused for eleven years to appear in the Russian church or accept the Russian "pope." They baptized their own children and were married by their aged men, a wretched tolerance being exercised by the "pope" for such money as they could put together. Finally, in 1854, on the eve of the Crimean War, all the brave confessors of the village were exiled en masse to Siberia. These inhuman measures were repeated in many parishes—the reader may peruse with pity the pages in which Père Lescoeur (op. cit., pp. 88-91) describes the treatment of the Uniats of Porozoff and Walkowysk from 1834 to 1862.

The interrogatory of the twelve-year-old swineherd, Stephen Suchonink, is characteristic of the temper and the principles both of the persecution and the persecuted. It deserves, as do many other pages of this history, to be written on plates of gold. The cause of Catholic unity can never perish while it can inspire such accents of devotion on the lips of babes and sucklings. Moreover, there can be no truth in the charges of ancient wrongs done by the Latin clergy to the ancestors of these Uniats, so long as it can be shown that in the Uniat villages of 1839 there existed not only no resentful memory of this alleged violence, but on the contrary a great respect and love for Catholic unity, visible in the headship of the Bishop of Rome. It is to the accident of her evasion that we owe the knowledge of the sufferings of Irena Macrina Mieczyslawska, Abbess of Minsk, and her companions. These pages, typical of a thousand similar wrongs, stirred the heart of Catholic Europe and revealed abundantly the depths of violence and mendacity that existed in the official heart of Russia, but for any softening of the same they might as well have been cast on the winds that sweep the endless steppes of Muscovy.¹²

¹² *Martyre de Soeur Irène-Makryna Mieczyslawska et de ses compagnons en Pologne.* Paris, 1846; cf. Szadowski, "Macrina Mieczyslawska, Aebtissin von Minsk," Freiburg, 1864.

Of such a nature was the storm that tore away from Catholic unity, at one fell gust, some two million Ruthenians¹⁸ and cleared Russian soil of nearly every vestige of Roman influence and authority in matters of religion.

In the seventeenth century Rome could contemplate eight millions of 'Ruthenian Uniats' living in peace and harmony in Little Russia and White Russia, commingling with their Latin brethren of Lithuania and the Ukraine, but retaining their ancient liturgical rites, language and customs, their married clergy and their national and racial habits. It was a noble hope, owing to the efforts of Eugene IV. at the Council of Florence, to the prayers and labors and trials of holy souls in the sixteenth century, to the religious zeal of the Kings of Poland and the tireless devotion of several religious orders, notably the Jesuits. It did seem as if a wedge had been entered in the hopeless mass of apathy and quasi-death that stood for the religious life of Russia, as if the Greek schism might be practically closed could these Catholic Ruthenians continue to increase and eventually draw over the huge bulk of their own race. Divine Providence ordered it otherwise, and even tolerated one more fierce outbreak of imperial hypocrisy and mendacity and of domestic treason in high ecclesiastical office.

After 1839 there remained, not in ancient Russian territory, but in the kingdom of Poland, one Ruthenian see, that of Chelm and Beltz, in the department of Lublin. By decrees of July 14 (26), 1864, and June 18 (30), 1866, Alexander II. confirmed its existence with certain rights and privileges of the Ruthenians of Poland. But this was only in expectation of the proper traitor or rather series of traitors. In 1871 Marcell Popiel, Archbishop of the Cathedral of Chelm, became administrator of the diocese, having first pledged himself in favor of the extermination of this last remnant of the Ruthenian Uniats. The Diocese of Chelm was united by him, May 11, 1875, with the schismatic archbishopric of Warsaw. Popiel was made Bishop of Lublin with residence in Chelm. All the faithful Ruthenians of Poland were pursued anew, in the same spirit and with the same means as of old—the usual place of exile was the province of Orenburg or that of Cherson. The knout of the executioner and the sabre of the Cossack, together with odious comedies of popular submission, soon Russianized the See of Chelm. Its three hundred Ruthenian parishes and 250,000 Uniat souls were inscribed on the registers of the imperial church,

¹⁸ Marion, "Histoire de l'Eglise" (Paris, 1905), III., 733. According to official (unreliable) date, there were yet in Russia 87,994 Uniats in 1889. Among them 10,737 were living in marriages not recognized by the government, and 29,339 were yet unbaptized.—*Century Magazine*, July, 1905, p. 460.

and the last official trace of the union of 1595 was wiped out. Schismatically inclined Galician priests of the Ruthenian rite had come over from Austrian Poland to aid this evil work, moved by hatred of Polish influence, by Russian gold and by an insane Slavophilism that the Russian Government carefully nourished in the sense of its own pretensions.¹⁴ It may be added that while Russia was engaged in this infamous business she was preparing to wage war against Turkey (1877) in favor of the Christians of the East, far less cruelly oppressed than her own Ruthenian subjects in Poland and Lithuania.¹⁵

IV.

All the ecclesiastical traitors of the Ruthenians, high and low, put forth as a principal excuse and justification of their conduct the supreme duty of preserving the original purity of the Greek rite as practised in Little Russia and White Russia from time immemorial. They asserted that for the last two centuries great violence had been used by Polish nobles and Latin religious orders to compel the abandonment of their rite by multitudes of Ruthenians, even whole villages and territories. The Latin Catholics were also accused of continually corrupting the Ruthenian forms of worship by the introduction of new ceremonies, feasts and religious customs, and of encouraging the personal transition of Ruthenians from Greek to the Latin rite. Similar accusations are accumulated in Count Tolstoi's "History of Roman Catholicism in Russia" (Paris, 1864), but when asked for the proofs of his charges they were not forthcoming. It is true, says Père Lescoeur (*op. cit.*, p. 19), that the Polish aristocracy did not always govern wisely in the broad lands it had conquered from Russia in the Dnieper Valley during the sixteenth century; that the Ruthenian nobles had almost entirely passed over to the Latin rite before the end of the eighteenth

¹⁴ All the unfortunate priests of Galicia, voluntary or involuntary exiles, are attracted to the Diocese of Chelm, where, like Popel, they become canons, parish priests or even Bishops, replacing the faithful shepherds, who are driven out or sent to Siberia. Their condition in life is quite wretched. Being married and fathers of families, they appreciate highly the subventions from Holy Russia. They are also very numerous, and through them the 2,300,000 Ruthenians of Galicia and the 800,000 of Hungary and Transsylvania are exposed to the political intrigues of Russia, whose pretensions to Galicia are based not only on the Russian origin of nearly one-half Galicia, but also on the identity of rite with that of the Ruthenians of Poland."—Lescoeur, *op. cit.*, 438.

¹⁵ Cardinal Hergenroether, "Kirchengeschichte," III., 897; cf. *Civiltà Cattolica*, 1875, v. 632 (series ix.), and *Etudes Religieuses* (1874), 25, 548; (1875) 943. The details of the suppression of Chelm and Belts are given by Lescoeur, *op. cit.*, pp. 418-471.

century, and thereby lowered the status of the Greek rite, which was henceforth the rite of the serfs and the poor. It is also true that, in spite of the Papal provisions, the Greek rite of the Ruthenians suffered some corruption of Latin usages. Nevertheless, there are extant no historical proofs of genuine Polish or Latin oppression of the Ruthenians as such. The admirable "Life of St. Josaphat Kuncewitch," by Dom Guépin (Paris, 1874), gives ample evidence of the fact that, unwisely enough, both Polish nobles and clergy were rather prone to discourage the Union of 1595 and to encourage the schismatic efforts of their Russian neighbors and rivals. The Polish Kings of the seventeenth century were, as a rule, tolerant and favorable, in a measure unknown to contemporary European rulers, to whom the peace of Augsburg and the Treaty of Westphalia had left a free hand in the religious affairs of their States. Not only did the elected Kings of Poland tolerate a Græco-Russian hierarchy in the ancient territory of Kiew, but they confirmed and endowed the local university, established by the schismatic patriarch and learned enemy of Rome, Peter Mogilas; they tolerated closer relations between the schismatic patriarchs of Kiew and Moscow, nor had they any reason to regret this attitude, since it resulted in the return to Catholic unity of the Sees of Leopold, Przemyśl and Smolensk. In spite of the increasing power and prestige of Russia during the seventeenth century, and the corresponding decline of Polish fortune and constitutional wisdom, the last traces of the Russian schism were steadily tending to disappear throughout Lithuania and the Ukraine. As a matter of fact the sacred Catholic work of the Union of Brzesk in 1595, the outcome at once of religious and political causes, was consecrated by the glorious martyrdom of the Archbishop of Polozck, Josaphat Kuncewitch (November 12, 1623),¹⁶ and the Jesuit Bobola (May 16, 1655). Joseph Velamin Rutzki, Uniat Archbishop of Kiew (1613-1635) escaped with difficulty from the savage hatred of the Russian party, and merited to be called by Urban VIII. "the Athanasius of Russia."

Far from tolerating or conniving at the destruction or corruption of the Ruthenian rite, discipline and customs, the Popes of Rome have never ceased to insist on their maintenance and integrity. What guarantee could be more formal or explicit than the action of St. Pius V. in 1568, when he declared, apropos of the new missal and breviary corrected by the desire of the Council of Trent, that they were not obligatory on any church that was in possession of

¹⁶ Cf. the Life of St. Josaphat by Dom Guépin. It contains accounts of other cruel sufferings inflicted on the Uniates by the schismatics. It is also valuable for its historical account of the relations of Poland with the Græco-Russian Church, the Union of Brzesk and the vicissitudes of the Ruthenian rite and people.

its own rite or liturgy for two hundred years? Clement VIII. accepted the Union of Brzesk in 1595 with the precise condition of maintaining the rite, customs and ceremonies of the Ruthenians such as they had been in the days of their ancient and original union with Rome.¹⁷ Since then there has been no change of attitude on the part of the Holy See, and each succeeding Pontiff has renewed the provisions of his predecessors that aimed at a proper respect for the ancient Greek rite of the people of Russian origin in the once vast ecclesiastical territory of Holy Kiew, the cradle, be it remembered, of Russian Christianity.¹⁸ The famous Council of Zamosc in 1720 regulated still further the relations between the Latin Poles and the Ruthenian Uniats. Its decrees were carefully considered

¹⁷ Cf. Baron d'Avril, "Les Eglises autonomes et autocéphales" (451—1885), Paris, 1895, pp. 37-45, gives the petition of the Ruthenian Bishop of Brzesk and the Roman formula or confession of faith in an interesting contemporary French translation by Marc Lescarbot, Parisian lawyer and first historian of Nova Scotia, "un précieux et même touchant document de la langue religieuse de la France à la fin du XVI. siècle," ed. by Prince Galitzin, Paris, 1856. Many official documents of the Holy See, that alone manifest the spirit and intentions of Catholicism in this matter, are indicated by Cardinal Hergenrother, "Kirchengeschichte," III, 328-329, 559. The extensive Bullarium of Benedict XIV. contains many very important documents, and it is to be remembered that his legislation is yet valid and authoritative. The efforts of Pius IX. and Leo XIII. to maintain the purity of Oriental rites and to reassure the Christian races and peoples of the Orient are so numerous that a large volume would scarcely describe them with accuracy. Cf. d'Avril, "Documents relatifs aux Eglises de l'Orient et à leurs rapports avec Rome," Paris, 3d ed., 1885; Nilles, "Kalendarium Manuale utriusque ecclesiae," I, Innsbruck, 1896; "Synbolae ad illustrandam historiam ecclesiae orientalis in terris coronae S. Stephani," 2 v.; Silbernagl, "Verfassung und gegenwaertiger Bestand Sämtlicher Kirchen des Orients," 2d ed. (1904), 325-335; Michel, "La Question religieuse en Orient et l'Union des Eglises," Paris, 1893, pp. 87-93. Cf. also passim "Acta Pii IX." and "Acta Leonis XIII.," Rome, 1846-1903, annual official publications of public Papal documents. The reader may also consult with profit Theiner, "Vetera Monumenta Poloniae et Lithuaniae," fol. Rome, 1864, and Fr. Pierling, S. J., "La Russie et le Saint Siège," Paris, 3 vols., 186, 1901; Beurlier, "Le Pape et les Eglises d'Orient," *Revue du Clergé Français*, December, 1894; P. Fournier, "La Constitution de Léon XIII. sur les Eglises Unies, *Revue générale de droit international public*," Paris, January, 1895.

¹⁸ Leger, "La Chronique de Nestor," Paris, 1890; cf. Pisani, "A Travers l'Orient," Paris, 1897, pp. 117-118: "The Russians never took part in the doctrinal polemics nor in the political conflicts of the Byzantines. They were one element of the Oriental patriarchate, and as such shared its vicissitudes. Hence no precise date, no striking event can be pointed out as the origin of the separation of Russia from Rome. It took place implicitly, gradually, without apparent motives, by reason of the Russian incorporation with the patriarchate of Constantinople. When the latter broke with Rome its obedient subjects everywhere were supposed to follow the example of the dominant see. On the other hand, the influence of the Greeks, who often held the dioceses of Russia, their violent theological quarrels with the Latins, and their perfidious insinuations sufficed to create an abyss whose depth only future ages should ascertain." Cf. Pitzipios, "L'Eglise Orientale," Rome, 1855.

at Rome in 1724 and positive instructions added that aimed at the strict observation of the traditional rite of the Uniats.¹⁹ In this Council, as on other occasions, the Holy See was watchful lest the purity of Catholic faith should be affected by the close contact of the Ruthenians with their schismatic brethren of the Russian race. The commemoration of the Pope in the Mass and the recitation of the Filioque in the Creed were so intimately connected with the Catholic faith that there could be no reason for objecting to them. It was, in all probability, the retention of precisely these two items that quickened the opposition of the Holy Synod under Nicholas and called forth the imperial cruelties. On the other hand, the Latin Church had never ceased to develop a rich and attractive devotional life, while for many centuries the religious spirit, both before and after the loss of Constantinople, the Greeks had been sinking into somnolency and the repose of decay. In close contact with the devotional activity of the Polish communities, the Ruthenians could not but admire and imitate the devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, frequent reception of the sacraments, the use of the rosary, the system of confraternities and the like. All this was a scandal in the eyes of the idle and corrupt Russian State clergy, also a menace to the supremacy of the autocratic régime in Russia. Its apathetic millions might one day awake to the promise of better things, cast off the carefully nurtured ignorance of Catholicism, and reconsider this relation with their Christian brethren of Western Europe. The Ruthenian Uniats were the open door for these splendid hopes; hence it must be closed with all due haste and thoroughness. The Catholic statesmen of Central and Western Europe paid little enough attention to the incredible expansion of Russia in the seventeenth century, and the pretensions of the Muscovite to the inheritance of the Palaeologi seemed of little account. In those days Poland was their "sick man." The eyes of European diplomacy seemed closed to the great political use the Romanoffs were making of the racial identity of the great centres of Moscow and Kiew. The former was growing yearly in stable and centralized power, in population and in political use dom. Iwan the Great and Iwan the Cruel had contributed their large share to the work of Russian consolidation, and a Peter the Great could at last look down on the chess-board of European politics from a vantage ground of security created for him in the long reigns of a few predecessors who had trampled under foot systematically the feudal pretensions of boyards and the religious consciousness of patriarchs, while they led the Christian peasantry

¹⁹ Its decrees are found in the second volume of the "Collectio Concilliorum Lacensis."

of their limitless plains in successful combat against Mongol, Tartar and Turk. The autocratic soul of Czardom is no development of history, but rather the issue of many centuries of Russian "Sinnen and Trachten," as much a product of the monotonous "Black Earth" plains of the Volga and the Dnieper as their flowery vegetation or their melancholy atmosphere, a curious mosaic of history, race, climate and topography, such as perhaps will never again be shown to mankind.

V.

The Polish insurrection of 1830-1831 was a very ill-starred undertaking. Russia had indeed done more than enough to rouse the high-spirited Poles to action. Religious oppression, the kindling of race hatred, the constant violation of the Constitution that Alexander I. had forced on the kingdom in 1815, the unpopularity of Grand Duke Constantine, the exclusion of the Polish army from the war against the Turks (1829) and other grievances, more or less urgent and capital, stirred the heart of Poland. It was yet a State in some real sense. An army of 60,000 men, in good condition, kept up the hope of the nation and the military training of a warlike race. The Warsaw outbreak of November, 1830, took on the character of a national uprising. The news of the July days in Paris and similar movements in Europe fed the passions of the oppressed people; brilliant skirmishes and some victories encouraged their leaders, but from the beginning the fate of the movement was sealed. Neither England nor France could lift a hand to help it, for an inimical and conniving Prussia stood guard for her northern co-parcener along the flaming border of Europe's "Dark and Bloody Land." By September, 1831, the Russian general could notify the Czar that Warsaw lay at his feet. "Order reigns in Warsaw!" was the proud laconic announcement of the Russian chancery to sympathetic but weak Europe of the thorough overthrow of the White Eagle. Discordant military counsels and radical dissension as to the main object and character of the uprising lamed all bravery and devotion. A Chlopiczki and a Czartoryski differed from Joachim Lelewel and his followers—the noble and the soldier from the academic thinker and the dreamer over the vanished glories of the Jagellons, so long the buffer of mediæval Europe and the hammer of Tartar and Turk. Nicholas refused to listen to any compromise during the conflict. This apostle of absolutism was determined to exhibit to Europe a clear diagnosis, *in corpore vili*, of the ailments that the revolution was everywhere nourishing. Execution, stern and implacable, walked the land.

Confiscation, imprisonment, Siberian exile, were the fate of all concerned and of many innocent victims of the uprising. There was no longer even a simulacrum of a Polish State. The kingdom disappeared, the Constitution of 1815 vanished, the army was incorporated with that of Russia. Taxation, governmental districts, judicial procedure, were all recast on Russian lines and the administration of Poland confided to a horde of needy and corrupt Russians, with the usual proportion of base and traitorous Poles. It was the Ireland of Oliver Cromwell and King William, with here and there a line of discrimination. In the former Russian provinces of Poland there had been sympathy for the insurgents on the part of their fellow-Catholics, the Ruthenians. Czartoryski's educational propaganda had made some headway, but Nicholas crushed remorselessly the tender plant. The University of Wilna was closed, the Polish tongue banished from the schools and the religious measures set on foot that in less than ten years consummated the scandalous apostasy of nearly the whole Ruthenian rite in Russian territory.

Now the Latin Catholics of Poland were made to feel the weight of autocratic anger. The convents were confiscated en masse; of three hundred there remained scarcely one-third. Vicious and complaisant ecclesiastics were raised to episcopal sees in order to execute the imperial will. Courageous Bishops and priests were exiled for their refusal to concur in the same. Bands of soldiers harassed the Polish land incessantly and expelled on all sides the monks and priests who yet sustained the spirit of the Poles, and bade them never despair of their religion or their fatherland. The official "*Espozizione documentata*" of Pius IX.²⁰ contains among other documents the detailed report of Mgr. Holowinski, Archbishop of Mohilew, and alone is sufficient to convict the Czar of mendacity, hypocrisy and utter disregard of all Christian principle in his dealings with his unhappy Roman Catholic subjects of Poland and their protector, the Holy See. Diminution of parishes enforced scarcity of seminary students, closing of Catholic churches, enforced transportation of thousands of refractory Poles to distant parts of Russia, building of schismatic churches, encouragement of bad and insubordinate priests, cruel exile of the steadfast clergy, minute harassing of Catholic life in all its manifestations were the order of the day during all the reign of Nicholas, and while he was as constantly assuring the Holy See that his imperial word was the guarantee of accurate execution of the reasonable wishes of the Holy Father.²¹

²⁰ Rome, "*Segreteria di Stato*," 1866, translated into French, Paris, 1868.

²¹ On December 17, 1845, shortly after his famous visit to Gregory XVI,

Although the soul of Nicholas harbored so many traits of a peculiarly vicious and immoral nature in a ruler of men, and although he was nearly all his reign, as it were, "on the knees of the gods," he still desired to appear before civilized Europe as a man of honor, a model of righteousness and correct deportment in all things. Otherwise the sanctity of Russia would be affected, and the spirit of the revolution rejoice to point out iniquity crowned and regnant, the lie seated on the prone corpse of truth, sheer force holding by the throat the refined figure of civilization. Hence he is concerned to throw a cloak of reasonableness and equity over all his acts. He appeals, as did his grandmother Catharine, to the current prejudices and sentiments; thus shall his name be sung in the academies of learned men who live on the imperial bounty and in the venal press that alone he tolerates in his Russia. His measures against the Catholic convents²² are all taken in their interest and in the interest of the Roman Church and according to its spirit and even its laws! He confiscates their property, but to found charitable institutions and schools (!), or even "to free the clergy from cares that are incompatible with their estate." So shall the Paris mob be flattered when St. Petersburg repeats thus patly its lesson. The organic statute of February 14, 1832, is granted to Poland (on the morrow of the insurrection) in the name of liberty of conscience, to be executed as we have seen. He promises the defeated Poles at least provincial assemblies in place of their suppressed Parliament; he never convoked these assemblies, and the Poles were too weak to compel him to keep his word. Knowing the principles, convictions and personal character of Gregory XVI., he entertains him with assurances of the imperial resolution to uphold ancient order and impose silence and restraint on the revolution. Knowing also the Papal sense of duty and the earnest representations of authorized counsellors, he hastens to protest, in autograph letters and by his envoys, that he is resolved to protect his Catholic subjects, respect their convictions and assure them a peaceful condition of life. He granted certain amnesties to the Polish insurgents on paper, but as to their execution let the

Czar Nicholas wrote to the Pope as follows: "The Emperor begs the Sovereign Pontiff to believe with all certainty that no one desires more than His Majesty the maintenance of the Roman Church in Russia and in Poland on a footing at once dignified and respectable. The prayers that the Emperor offers up to heaven embrace with equal solicitude, and without distinction of rite, the spiritual interests of all the peoples confided to his care by Divine Providence. Whatever can be done to realize the intentions of the Holy Father without conflicting with the organic laws of the Empire or violating the rights and canons of the dominant Church will be done. *The imperial word guarantees this to His Holiness.*"—"Esposizione documentata," II., 17. Lescoeur, *op. cit.*, 100-101.

²² Rohrbacher, "Hist. de l'Eglise," XXVIII., 412.

foregoing persecution of the Polish Catholics reply, also such facts as the following: In September, 1831, he ordered five thousand Polish nobles to be transported from Podolia to the borders of the Caucasus; they were to be selected among those who took part in the late insurrection and returned within the appointed time to make known their repentance.²³

VI.

The decade of general ecclesiastical history from 1830 to 1840 will always attract the attention of students as one in which came fast to their ending certain lines and currents of European affairs set in motion on the morrow of the Battle of Waterloo. The famous alliance of the three imperial powers, both formal and moral, seemed awhile to check the flow of revolutionary ideas and success. The Congress of Vienna (1815) decreed, in eternal oblivion of the revolution, the restoration of the temporal power of the Holy See, and within the sphere of their influence the three world powers proceeded to restore and consolidate anew an autocracy that for several reasons was more odious than any of the forms of civil absolutism let loose by Martin Luther. On the other hand, secret political societies multiplied on the continent and through Russia and Poland, and nourished among the poor and lowly, *i. e.*, among the European multitudes, feelings of discontent and anger that were destined to find vent in various ways and in several quarters. False or hopeless ideals of civil welfare were held up by the Paris clubs and their imitators and by the miscellaneous Jacobins of every ilk and nation. The St. Simonians of France and the Carbonari of Italy, however different their aims, sympathized in their denunciation of all obstacles, *i. e.*, the existing forms of government. Civil society everywhere felt the ground weak and uncertain. It was a period of reaction, therefore, in its own way violent and extreme and particularly odious to a multitude of the youthful and middle-aged who had been nurtured on the hopes and promises of 1789. To them this period seemed like the threshold of a political hell.

Vestibulum ante ipsum primisque in faucibus Orci.

The Papacy was but slowly recovering from the unspeakable humiliation of the preceding fifty years. Traditions of administration, habitual sources of information, continuity of policy, assured contact with the dominant factors of civil life, had all been swept away or so modified as to make it a new world in which the See of Peter was not yet quite sure of its political assiette. The French Revolution had executed all the menaces and velleities of Jansenists,

²³ The Minister of Finance to the Governor of Podolia, September 9 (21), 1831.

Gallicans and Protestants—the future was dark and uncertain. The power and prestige of Russia were very much in evidence throughout Europe and were borne to the clouds by all manner of social and political serfs of the Czardom. The time was propitious for Nicholas to impress on Gregory XVI. the wisdom of coming to an understanding with him. The Polish insurrection was represented by the imperial agents as an outcome of Parisian revolutionary agitation, and the Polish clergy falsely made to appear as the foremost leaders in secret intrigue and open conflict. The Pope was urged to call this refractory clergy to repentance. At the same time he was assured that the repression of the insurrection had been a benefit to Catholicism. It was insinuated that the sanguinary movement was only the opening scene of a vast European rebellion against established order. As a matter of fact, the States of the Church were even then the scene of revolutionary agitation and uprisings. The agents of Prussia and Austria confirmed the desires of the Czar. Gregory XVI. accepted this statement of facts and wrote, June 9, 1832, to the Polish clergy an encyclical letter, in which he treated of the eternal maxims of the Church concerning submission to the temporal power, and asserted that the frightful calamities of the insurrection were owing solely to the cunning and mendacious manœuvres of those who “under pretext of religion lift up their heads in our unhappy age against the legitimate power of princes.” He went on to speak of the abuse of the credulity of the simple people by perverse men and insisted at length on the divine origin and character of civil obedience. Much of what he said was applicable at all times and in every land. The following phrase could concern only Poland:

Your very powerful emperor will always exhibit toward you great mildness, and will always receive with good-will our intercession in your favor; also all requests that you will make for the welfare of the Catholic religion, that the kingdom professes, and to which he has promised me that he will never refuse his protection.

In its doctrine the Papal document was inoffensive and correct, but the circumstances made it especially painful and odious in the eyes of the Poles and their sympathizers. Coming on the heels of an inglorious defeat and while the machinery of vengeance was yet active and urgent, it seemed like a denial of all right of rebellion against intolerable wrong and like a cruel abandonment to the victor of the faithful sons of Poland.²⁴

They were condemned on the representations of their powerful

²⁴ On the right of rebellion against the civil authority in given cases and situations, see Balmes, “Protestantism and Catholicity Compared,” cc. 54-56; also P. Ventura, “Essai sur le pouvoir public,” p. 295, and J. Torres Asensio, “Le droit des Catholiques de se défendre,” Paris, 1874 (cc., VII-VIII), and Crétineau-Joly, “L’Eglise Romaine devant la Révolution,” II., p. 241.

enemy and by that power for whose sake principally they had risen in a revolt that was imprudent enough, but was none the less heroic and objectively justified. Usually all Roman documents were strictly excluded from the empire, but this one was given the widest circulation. It was pointed out to all Poles that the Holy Father made no distinction between the Catholic faithful who had revolted and the irreligious revolutionaries. They were even led to believe that the Holy Father had excommunicated them. A cry of grief went up from a multitude of Catholic hearts. Some of them, like Montalembert, scarcely recovered from the condemnation of Lamennais, bled very deeply on this occasion.²⁵ Others, like Lacordaire in his "Lettres sur le Saint Siège," penetrated to the core of the situation and found relief in comparing the Papal action with that of Priam kissing the hand of Achilles while he beseeches the slayer of his son for the poor gift of his dead body. In the second edition of his work on the condition of Catholicism in Russia Père Lescoeur communicates a touching interview of the Polish nobleman and general, Count Zamoyski, with Gregory XVI.²⁶ In the course of this meeting the Polish patriot gave expression to the sentiments of sorrow and dejection which yet filled the hearts of his poor beaten compatriots who had imagined that they were defending the holiest of causes, and yet had incurred the Papal disapprobation. Thereupon the Holy Father seized him earnestly by the shoulders and with a look of reproach exclaimed with vehemence:

"Indeed, I never disapproved you. I did not understand you in the beginning, I admit, but in turn did you take sufficient pains to enlighten me in the course of your conflict? Yes, I have been deceived in your case; my own servants, to whom I am bound to give my confidence, allowed themselves to be deceived, and then led me into error. I deplored your misfortunes; but after all you had succumbed, all seemed finished, it remained to save religion from the wrath of an irritated victor. His menaces moved me profoundly; I trembled at the persecution that seemed ready to rage against you and to surpass all that had yet taken place. *I yielded to a downright challenge: it was stated to me that, to begin with, all the Bishops of Poland would be exiled to Siberia if I did not send them an order to submit.* I asked myself what would become of your unhappy nation, deprived of its shepherds and already so far removed from me that for a long time my voice has failed to reach you. I thought in conscience that in the presence of such dangers I could and ought to consent to address some words of resignation to your Bishops and recall to them what the apostles imposed upon all Christians, something also that the Church has invariably observed, viz., that obedience to the powers that be is a Christian duty, one of conscience and not of fear. I did not fail to add that in no case was it permitted such a power to insist on the commission of acts contrary to the laws of God or the Church. . . . What more was necessary to reassure your consciences? When my letter reached you, were not the rights of the Church and religion already sufficiently trampled on? I might perhaps complain that you forgot to keep me sufficiently informed. Perhaps, too, I might reproach you with not reading attentively enough my letter, with not perceiving in the very delay of the same the constraint that had been put upon me."

²⁵ Lecanuet, "Vie de Montalembert" (Paris, 1903), I., pp. 311, 354.

²⁶ Lescoeur, "L'Eglise Catholique et le Gouvernement Russe" (Paris, 1903), second ed., pp. 110-113.

The Pope, moreover, authorized Count Zamoyski to make known this conversation, but with discretion, he added:²⁷

"I had entered the Papal presence," says the Count, "with bitterness and with much prejudice against his person; I quitted it filled with gratitude and the deepest veneration."

In the latter part of 1832 the Pope repeatedly attempted to obtain some redress for the suffering Catholics. He desired, among other things, the presence of a Papal agent at St. Petersburg, but this measure of confidence and justice was never agreed to by the Czar. While the compulsory conversion of the Ruthenians went bravely on, the cruelties practised on Catholic Poland increased. Only evasive or impudent answers were vouchsafed the letters of the Pope, and he could soon convince himself that the Czar had overreached him, played upon his well-known detestation of revolutionary principles and taken advantage of his monastic simplicity and inexperience of the world. What Nicholas had extorted from him was not a weapon against the revolution, but one against Catholicism itself. The Russian Government continued to affect a total ignorance of all the facts quoted by the Pope in his correspondence—oppression of the clergy, confiscation of the convent properties, deportation of thousands of Polish children to schismatic territories. When the Pope invoked the treaty of 1773, that guaranteed the liberty of the Catholic religion, the Emperor replied that since the insurrection Poland had only such rights as he cared to allow! Thus the Czar is *post Deum terrenus Deus*, and keeps locked up in *scrinio pectoris sui* all laws, human, ecclesiastical and divine! This answer was returned in 1833, after the close of the insurrection; moreover, after the publication of the organic statute of 1832, which the Pope had urged as a valid charter of religious liberty that even a Czar could not repudiate. "Be silent," said Repnine in the Diet of 1767, when the Polish deputies demanded the religious rights formally granted by Catharine. "Be silent; it belongs to me alone to know the true meaning of my sovereign's declarations."²⁸

²⁷ General Zamoyski's account of his interview with Gregory XVI. is strikingly confirmed by the mute but eloquent fact that this encyclical to the Polish Bishops is not to be found in the Bullarium of Pope Gregory. . . . By this suppression of the document its nullity was publicly avowed. It had been obtained by threats and trickery, and by a false statement of facts which had entirely disfigured in the Pontifical mind the true character of the Polish insurrection.—Lescoeur, *op. cit.*, pp. 113-114.

²⁸ This quiet nullification by the local authorities of even the miserable privileges of a persecuted race and religion is one of the most odious forms of Russian oppression. The offender is seldom or never punished; he knows too well that he is, above all, an agent of extermination. That the system has not changed may be seen from the following fact: "Appeal to the law and you invite the revenge of a horde of officials, who rarely lose an opportunity of showing their contempt for the laws. A business man

The corruption of diplomacy could go no farther unless, perhaps, we recall the cruel cynicism with which the Czar denied that he had ever given the famous order of April 10, 1832, for the deportation to Minsk of all the children in the Kingdom of Poland between six and seventeen, with the eventual purpose of sending them to the distant and inhospitable "military colonies" of the frontier. Several years afterwards, in 1834 and 1838, the children of Polish nobles were still sold in their native villages at thirty dollars a head.²⁹ No wonder that a Polish mother cast herself upon the body of her exiled child and plunged a poinard into his heart rather than see him stripped at one blow of mother, religion and fatherland! The Russian agents at Rome continued to implore the Pope not to listen to any reports of religious affairs in Poland, save such as reached him through the hands of the Czar's accredited representatives. But the anti-Catholic matrimonial legislation of 1836, the cruel treatment and forced resignation of the brave Bishop of Podlachia, Marcellus Gutkowski, the ineffable dishonor of the Ruthenian apostasy, the prohibition in 1840 to use any longer the term "Greek Uniat"—these unjust and oppressive acts that cover the decade from 1832 to 1842 moved at last a long-suffering Pope to the magnificent allocution of July 22, 1842, in which he made known to the Catholic world his constant and numerous but useless efforts for the welfare of Catholicism in Poland, and rose above himself by the touching narrative of his deception by the Czar, whereby he had given cause to the faithful of Poland to believe that the Holy See had abandoned them to their enemy.

VII.

But if Pope Gregory could be deceived, he could not be restrained from making a public confession of the facts in the case. When patience had ceased to be a virtue and the opinion of his own entourage had become noticeably adverse, he broke a long silence and delivered before the assembled Cardinals the famous allocution we have just referred to. Despite all contrary accusations, he had never been wanting in zeal and resolution to improve the condition of Polish Catholicism. He declared that he had been circumvented by its enemies, after their habitual fraudulent manner. He

about a month ago went to a certain provincial governor and made a protest against some flagrant abuse of authority. The great man airily waved aside his expostulations. 'But the law?' began the visitor. The governor took a thick book from his table and held it so that the title could not escape being seen—it was the Russian Code—and then put it upon his chair and sat upon it."—*Century Magazine*, July, 1905, p. 457.

²⁹ Lescoeur, p. 118, Ukase of April 13, 1838.

had long borne the accusations of negligence, complicity and even cowardice, and had come to know that not a few looked on him as a stumbling block and a stone of scandal. He would now, however, relate in their true order and meaning all the phases of the negotiations with Czar Nicholas since the beginning of his pontificate. Then followed an outline of the events in question and a collection of (90) "pièces justificatives" or authoritative documents. The Pope had stooped to conquer. All Europe applauded this brave act of self-denial and Christian humility. Public opinion, enlightened passed to the side of the Papacy and the oppressed. A weak and aged man had stood forth before the world as a champion of truth and affixed the indelible stigma of mendacity upon the forehead of the world's proudest and most powerful monarch. It seemed for a moment as if Innocent III. or Gregory IX. had stepped upon the scene. While the Papal exposé of facts did not greatly relieve the sufferings of the Catholics of Poland, it simplified the political situation by the removal of all equivocal sentiment as to the attitude of the Papacy. It also restored to the latter its liberty of action and arrested a growing discontent among very faithful children of the Roman Church.

Three years later (1845) Czar Nicholas came to Rome. His meeting with Gregory XVI. was an historic one, although no reliable account of their mutual discourse has ever been made known. In his "Recollections of the Last Four Popes" Cardinal Wiseman has left us a graphic account of the imperial visit to the Vatican that has often been quoted, but can never lose a certain racy vigor of expression and a noble breadth and accuracy of historic view:

The most painful of his conflicts, however, was one face to face with the greatest of Europe's sovereigns, a man accustomed to command without contradiction and to be surrounded by complete submission. He did not imagine that there was a human being who would presume to read him a lesson, or still less to administer him a rebuke. It may be proper to premise that the present Emperor of Russia, while Czarewicz, visited Rome and was received with the utmost respect by all ranks and with extreme kindness by the Pope. The young prince expressed himself highly gratified by his reception, and I was told by those to whom he had declared it that he had procured a portrait of Gregory, which he said he should always keep as that of a friend deeply venerated and esteemed. Further, in 1842 the Emperor, his father, had sent very splendid presents to the Pope—a vase of malachite, now in the Vatican library, and a large supply of the same precious material for the Basilica of St. Paul. Still he had not ceased to deal harshly, not to say cruelly, with his Catholic subjects, especially the Poles. They were driven into the Greek communion by putting it out of their power to follow their own worship; they were deprived of their own Bishops and priests, and even persecuted by more violent inflictions and personal sufferings. On this subject the Holy See had both publicly and privately complained, but no redress and but little, if any, alleviation had been obtained. At length, in December, 1845, the Emperor Nicholas I. came himself to Rome. It was observed, both in Italy and, I believe, in England, how minute and unrelaxed were the precautions taken to secure him against any danger of conspiracy; how his apartment, bed, food, body-guard were arranged with a watchful eye to the prevention of any surprise from hidden enemies. Be this as it may, nothing amiss befell him, unless it was his momentous interview with the head of that Church which he had mercilessly persecuted, with him whose rival he considered

himself as real autocratic head of a large proportion of what he called the "Orthodox Church" and as recognized protector of its entire communion. It was arranged that the Emperor should be attended by M. de Bouteneff, his Minister at Rome, and that the Pope should have a Cardinal at his side. He selected, as has been said, the English Cardinal Acton. This was not a usual provision for a royal visit, but gave it rather the air of a conference; and so in truth it was. The Pope felt he had a solemn and trying duty to perform. Could he allow the persecutor of his flock to approach him and depart without a word of expostulation and even of reproof? Could he receive him with a bland smile and insincere accolade; speak to him of the unmeaning topics of the hour, or of the cold politics of the world? Impossible! It would have been at variance not with personal disposition, but with the spiritual character which he held of father of the faithful, defender of the weak, shepherd of the ravened flock, protector of the persecuted, representative of fearless, uncompromising, martyred Pontiffs, vicar of Him who feared no stalking any more than prowling wolf. It would have been to his conscience a gnawing and undying reproach if he had lost the opportunity of saying face to face what he had written and spoken of one absent, or if he had not employed his privilege as a sovereign to second his mission as a Pontiff. He would have confirmed by his cowardice or his forbearance, though it might have been called courtly refinement or gentleness of character, all the self-confidence and fearlessness of a fanatical persecutor, placed above all but some great moral control.

The Popes no longer stood, as in the thirteenth century, at the head of an united Christendom, the mouthpiece of the moral sense and the intimate convictions of all the peoples of Europe. Schism, heresy, apostasy, revolution and indifference had swept away multitudes in every part of Europe from their once affectionate allegiance to the See of Peter. Gregory XVI. could now look forward to no other applause than that of his own conscience and of outraged justice. It was now the case of impersonal right clothed in the simple majesty of a feeble old priest withstanding with successful boldness the greatest of modern autocrats at the acme of his power and prestige.

Certainly, much hung in the balance of that Pontiff's deliberation how he should act. That meekest of men, Pius VII., had not neglected the opportunity of his captivity to enumerate with fervid gentleness to his powerful master the evils which the Church suffered at his hands. Gregory never undertook any grave work without much prayer, and one so momentous as this was not assuredly determined on except after long and earnest supplication. What were the Emperor's intentions, what his ideas, what his desires in coming to Rome, and having necessarily a personal meeting with the Pope, it is impossible to conjecture. Did he hope to overcome him by his splendid presence, truly majestic, soldier-like and imperial? Or to cajole and win him by soothing speeches and insincere promises? Or to gain the interpretative approval of silence and forbearance? One must conjecture in vain. Certain it is that he came, he saw and conquered not. It has been already mentioned that the subject and particulars of the conference were never revealed by its only witness in Rome. The Pope's own account was brief, simple and full of conscious power: "I said to him all that the Holy Ghost dictated to me."

And that he had not spoken vainly, with words that had beaten the air, but that their strokes had been well placed and driven home, there was evidence otherwise recorded. An English gentleman was in some part of the palace through which the imperial visitor passed as he returned from his interview, and described his altered appearance. He had entered with his usual firm and royal aspect, grand as it was from statue-like features, stately frame and martial bearing, free and at his ease, with gracious looks and condescending gestures of salutation. So he passed through the long suite of ante-rooms, the imperial eagle, glossy, fiery, "with plumes unruffled and with eye unquenched," in all the glory of pinions which no flight had ever wearied, with beak and talon which no prey had yet resisted. He came forth again with head uncovered and hair, if it can be said of man, disheveled, haggard and pale, looking as though in an hour he had passed

through the condensation of a protracted fever; taking long strides, with stooping shoulders, unobservant, unsaluting; he waited not for his carriage to come to the foot of the stairs, but rushed out into the outer court and hurried away from, apparently, the scene of a discomfiture. It was the eagle dragged from his eyrie among the clefts of the rocks, "from his nest among the stars," his feathers crumpled and his eye quelled by a power till then despised.

The reflections of the illustrious artist of this unique scene concerning the rôle of the Pope are doubtless just and to the point. His conviction that from that day dated a juster treatment of the Polish Catholics was not destined to be sustained by the quick succeeding facts of religious oppression in every odious form it can put on. The deadly Byzantinism of the imperial character was too original and intense, too steadily fed by its native springs to permit him ever to see in free Catholicism anything but a menace against the common welfare of the state as his ancestors had consolidated it and he had inherited it.

But let us be fully just. The interview did not excite rancorous or revengeful feelings. No doubt the Pontiff's words were in the spirit of those on the High Priest's breastplate—"doctrine and truth," sound in principle and true in fact. They convinced and persuaded. Facts, with their proofs, had no doubt been carefully prepared, and could not be gainsaid. The strong emotion which Gregory on other occasions easily betrayed could not have been restrained here. Often in prayer has every beholder seen the tears running down his glowing countenance; often those who have approached him with a tale of distress, or stood by when news of a crime has been communicated to him, have seen his features quiver and his eye dim with the double sorrow of the apostle, the tear of weakness with the weak, the scalding drop of indignation for sin. This sensibility cannot have been stemmed, even by the coldness of an interpreted discourse, but must have accompanied that flow of eloquent words to which, when earnest, Gregory gave utterance.

All this must have told effectually where there could be nothing to reply. Mistaken zeal, early prejudice and an extravagance of national feelings had no doubt influenced the conduct of the Czar towards his Catholic subjects against the better impulses of his own nature, which Russians always considered just, generous and even parental. No one had before possessed the opportunity or the courage to appeal to the inward tribunal of this better sense.

The Concordat, signed in 1848, between Russia and the Holy See was never executed with honesty and equity. Its surveillance in Poland was entrusted to its worst enemy, Skripitzine. As if that were not enough, the new Russian criminal code made penal, and therefore illusory, nearly every right granted by the Concordat. From the days of Pierre de la Vigne some lawyer has ever stood close to the ear of absolutism in nearly every great Christian crisis and pointed out, for a consideration, how religion might be manacled and enslaved in the name of right and justice. In his memorable report of Pius IX. Holowinski, the Catholic Archbishop of Mohilew, laid bare all the ways of oppression, violent and hypocritical, that were followed during the remainder of the reign of Nicholas.³⁰ The latter died in 1855, after a successful consolidation of his personal authority and an equally successful series of cam-

³⁰ Lescœur, *op. cit.*, p. 125.

paigns against obsolete Persia and decrepit Turkey. He had extended the limits of the state, but had not deepened or ennobled the popular life. He created a venal and conscienceless press that in turn begot and justified the most insane forms of revolutionary propaganda. He was on all occasions the enemy of France and played a notable rôle in the upbuilding of modern Prussia and in the burning internal conflicts of Austria. He let loose and encouraged among his people a rabid Slavophilism, yet beneath its shadow he bound them with hopeless knots. He had no confidence in democracy that was to him as sin and hell. Yet he was bound to behold his empire insulted in the Crimean War by the two most democratic nations of Europe. He died in a kind of dumb impenitent despair February 19 (March 2), 1855, an unbending man of iron will, dogmatic confidence in himself and a firm persuasion that the proper destiny of mankind was an unquestioning obedience to the will of the successors of Michael Romanoff.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Washington, D. C.

A CATHOLIC COLLEGE IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

IT HAS often been remarked that history, though always repeating itself, is ever new. Not only are fresh documents daily brought to light, but the store of facts already known shapes itself differently, according to the standpoint from which it is viewed. In proportion as some special form of human activity is drawn attention to by the needs or the interests of the moment, it is given more prominence as a factor in the evolution of society. Hence the field of historical research is widened and the ever-fusing ore of history is recast into new moulds.

Thus, in the second half of the nineteenth century, the study of social questions originated a totally new conception of the Past, *i. e.*, from the point of view of political economy. A numerous school of historians have since made it their special object to inquire into the production and circulation of wealth at the various stages of social life. Thus also, *si parva licet componere magnis*, the keen interest in pedagogics roused of late by educational reforms has caused many to turn to the closer study of bygone theories. True it is that a theory as such "can claim but a secondary place in the logical structure of a science, yet no one can deny its primordial influence on the course of scientific research."¹ Hence we may say

¹ D. T. cf. "Revue des Questions Scientifiques," Vol. LV. (1904), p. 611.

that it is impossible perfectly to understand the working of our old Catholic colleges without going back to their origin and considering the circumstances in which they were founded and organized.

Beyond this, however, the history of Catholic education has a very useful lesson to teach :

Quien no sabe el pasado
Ciego va en el presente.²

The present position of Catholic schools is unquestionably full of difficulties, but it is stimulating and encouraging to consider what it was some three hundred years ago, and what was then achieved by men of enterprising spirit and energy. At the end of the sixteenth century, public education being made impossible for Catholic youth in England, arrangements had to be made for its continuance on the continent. Thus an "outlaw race of schools and colleges, the seminaries beyond the seas," became part of that wonderful Foundation Movement, which at the end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth century gave a new life to the Catholic Church in England and a new organism suited to these days of persecution.³

Prominent among these schools of the Catholic Renaissance was St. Omers College,⁴ the ancestor of Stonyhurst. But, though its history in later periods of its existence has often been told in detail, there is no connected record of the making and first organization of the college; and yet this first "link" in its evolution requires closer consideration if the training at St. Omers is to be fully understood. It will therefore be the object of the present article to make known this early "constitutional history" chiefly from unpublished documents.

Our principal authority is the "Custom-Book" of the college, of which more will be said later on.⁵ The information it gives us has been supplemented by some manuscripts in the possession of the Society of Jesus, which were kindly communicated to the present writer by Fr. Alfred Poncelet. They belong to the correspondence of the Fathers General with the German Assistancy ("Germaniae

² Who does not know the Past, goes through the Present like a blind man.

³ Cf. Fr. J. H. Pollen, S. J., "The Rise of the Anglo-Benedictine Congregation." (*The Month*, 1897, II., pp. 581-600.)

⁴ We prefer to use the old English spelling, "St. Omers," instead of the modern form, "St. Omer." Cf. Fr. Gerard, S. J., "Stonyhurst College," *Bel-fast*, 1894, p. 2. An interesting point of comparison is afforded by the description of college life at St. Alban's College, Valladolid, given by Bishop Yopez in 1599. (Cf. Dom Bede Camm, the Ven. John Roberts, O. S. B., or in the "Revue Bénédictine," Vol. XII. [1895], pp. 318 foll.)

⁵ It will be referred to in this paper as C-B. I gladly take this opportunity of expressing my gratitude to the Rev. D. A. Stracke, S. J., who found this MS. in the library of the Catholic University of Louvain and kindly brought it to my attention.

Epistolae ad Generalem”), and will here be referred to as “G. Ep.,” with the number of the volume and page. Other materials have been drawn from the Brussels “Archives du Royaume.” The most important among them is the “Responsio ad obiecta a Magistratu,”⁶ a petition sent by Fr. Schondonck in 1609 to the Privy Council of the Low Countries. Besides setting forth the chief objections of the local authorities, it gives a fairly complete notion of the working of the seminary.

The sources of a study of this nature being mostly decrees and regulations, it might be objected that it can only claim to furnish a theoretical notion of the management of the school, and not to record its actual working, since laws are often less observed in proportion as they are laid down more frequently. Yet, though it may not commend itself to the so-called historian who only records well ascertained battles and treaties, a study such as this may be highly interesting to him who examines the making of educational schemes.

It draws besides an additional interest from the fact that many of the institutions and customs first established at that early period have weathered most critical crises and still survive at Stonyhurst College. Readers acquainted with the latter will easily notice the resemblance, which, for fear of tedious repetition, will not be pointed out in this article.⁷

In connection with the early organization of the college we shall insist somewhat on the treatment received by the Catholic exiles at the hands of the Spanish authorities in the Netherlands. The help given to the founders of St. Omers or the hindrances with which they had to count not only contributed to frame the particular character of the college, but are also an element in the broader and more important history of religious and political relations between England and the Continent. As is well known, during the protracted duel between the Protestant Queen of England and Philip II., the champion of Catholicism, it was the common policy of each sovereign to help his adversary's dissenting subjects both in their native land and in his own dominions. Hence, when difficulties arise on the part of local authorities, they are commonly overruled by higher decisions from Spain or from Brussels.

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION.⁸

When the school Fr. Robert Parsons had founded in 1582 at Eu,

⁶ Brussels “Archives du Royaume,” Varia, S. J., carton 31.

⁷ For proof of this “continuity theory,” cf. Fr. Gerard, *op. cit.*, Chap. II.

⁸ Cf. Br. H. Foley, S. J., “Records of the English Province S. J.,” Vol. VII., pp. 36 foll. Fr. J. Gerard, *op. cit.*, p. 1 foll. See below some details on the date of foundation.

in Normandy, was seriously threatened in its existence⁹ negotiations were set on foot to start a new establishment at St. Omers.¹⁰ About the end of 1592 Dr. Richard Barret, acting on Fr. Parsons' advice,¹¹ presented a petition to the Magistracy of the town asking leave for twelve or fifteen of the students of Eu to settle at St. Omers and attend lectures at the college of the Walloon Jesuits.

The request, to which was appended a letter of recommendation from Jean de Vernois, Bishop of St. Omers (18 September, 1592)¹² was immediately granted, and Fr. Flack delegated by Father Parsons, put up in a small house with seven students and Fr. Nicholas Smith, their "ghostly" father and "minister" of the house.¹³ Before the end of the year the students numbered eighteen, and the little community moved into larger premises.¹⁴ Yet they were still at a great distance from the house of the Walloon Jesuits, where classes had to be attended. In consequence, leave was obtained from the Magistracy in 1593 to acquire the Hôtel de Berghes, place de l'Etats, just opposite the college. So far nothing but favor had been shown by the town authorities to the English refugees. These good feelings were still encouraged by a letter written on July 30, 1593, by the Governor of the Low Countries, Count Mansfelt. In the name of his master, Philip II., he recommends to the Magistracy the newly-founded seminary and the fathers of the Society of Jesus.¹⁵ But when, early in 1594, Fr. Flack petitioned to be allowed to acquire the Hôtel de Licques, an old mansion formerly belonging to the Countess de Roeux de Vellamonte, he met with a refusal. It must be noticed, however, that the attitude of the Magistracy came from no hostile disposition, though they were to show themselves quarrelsome enough a few years later; at this time they objected only to a lordly residence becoming religious property,

⁹ Fr. J. H. Pollen has clearly shown (*Stonyhurst Magazine*, Vol. 1 (1884), pp. 284 sq.) that the college continued at Eu till its removal to St. Omers.

¹⁰ On the reasons which determined the choice of this town, see Br. H. Foley, *loc. cit.*, quoting Fr. H. More's "Hist. Prov. Angl. S. J.," Vol. VI., p. 161.

¹¹ L'Abbé O. Bled, "Les Jésuites Anglais à St. Omer" ("Bulletin historique de la Société des antiquaires de la Morinie," Vol. VIII. [1890], p. 546). This assertion, which conflicts with Fr. H. More's statement (p. 162), may perhaps be explained by the great influence of Fr. Parsons on Dr. Barret, and by the fact that some of the students of Douay College (then at Rheims) had been sent to the seminary at Eu. (See J. Gillow, "Dict. of Engl. Cath.," s. v. Barret, Richard.)

¹² Cf. H. Piers, "Notice historique sur le collège Anglais de St. Omer" ("Archives . . . du Nord de la France," Vol. II. [1838], p. 5).

¹³ Cf. Br. Foley, "Records," Vol. VII., pp. 38, 101, 261-2; Vol. VIII., p. 719.

¹⁴ "L'Ancien hôtel du grand bâtard de Bourgoyne en la Tenne rue" (Abbé O. Bled, *op. cit.*, p. 547, from which the following details are drawn).

¹⁵ Cf. J. J. E. Proost, "Les réfugiés Anglais . . . en Belgique" (*Messenger des sciences historiques*, 1865, p. 300).

and advised the college authorities to look for a more modest building.

These difficulties were not to last long. Letters sent on March 4, 1594, by the King of Spain to the "Comte de Roelux, grand Baylly et Gouverneur de St. Omer," and to Bishop du Vernois¹⁶ helped to settle matters, and on October 24, 1594, leave was granted to the English seminary to purchase the Hôtel de Licques, on condition that it should not be exempted from the ordinary taxes levied on the other houses of the town.

This new site, where St. Omers College was to stand for nearly two centuries, offered the great advantage of being very near the Walloon house of the society. Nor was this settlement the only advantage the seminary derived from the favor of Philip II. To him also was due the endowment of the college, no small question in school organization. Already, in 1593, he had granted a pension of 10 scudi a month for every scholar, the town authorities being called upon to report on the number of boys actually present at the college.¹⁷

On May 16, 1594, he confirmed the pension of 2,000 pounds (scudi?) a year which he had granted, and gave leave to receive as many boys as could be supported without being a burden to the town.¹⁸ No wonder, then, if the college should have kept a grateful remembrance of its founder. Thus we find in the Custom-book (p. 202) that every year on September 13, the anniversary of the King's death, all priests are directed to offer Mass for his soul, and a Solemn Requiem was to be celebrated. The college, being thus provided with the necessary means of existence, entered on its regular course.

We may now turn to the study of its internal life. To understand the management of St. Omers Seminary it is important to notice at the outset its strictly ecclesiastical character. "Whereas, the chief aim of the founders of this college has been religious piety, so the first care of the fathers who govern and serve this college has always been and still is to promote true virtue in the minds of

¹⁶ Brussels "Archives du Royaume," Varia, S. J., carton 29. There also are to be found the deed of sale and the license of the magistracy, in which they expressly state that they submit to His Majesty's wishes.

¹⁷ Abbé O. Bled, *op. cit.*, p. 549, "Consillario Questori Generali finantiarum Christophoro Godin numerum famillae quotannis scripto tradidimus" (Fr. Schondonck's "Responsio," quoted above, "2a. Oblectio, de Numero").

¹⁸ H. Piers, *op. cit.*, p. 7. In a Latin petition to the King of Spain (second half of the seventeenth century) we find the following: "[Philippus II.] duas pensiones annuas eisdem seminario attribuit, unam 10,000 florenorum ex ipsa Hispania quotannis submitendam, alteram 6,200 florenorum a Finantiis Regiis in Belgio annue solvendam" (Brussels "Archives du Royaume," Varia, S. J., carton 29).

the students and to imbue them with religious principles."¹⁹ Indeed, St. Omers was chiefly intended by its founders to be an ecclesiastical school. Cardinal Allen initiated the foundation of seminaries, and thus prepared a new English clergy to take the place of that decimated by Elizabeth; but to Fr. Robert Parsons is due the credit of having completed this organization by commencing the college at Eu and later that of St. Omers. They were to be schools of secondary education destined to preserve Catholic boys from Protestant influences, but principally to prepare recruits for the greater seminaries of Douai, Rome and Spain.

In the minds of the founders the training received at St. Omers was designed both to pave the way for the higher studies and to inure the future priests from their boyhood to the duties of their high calling.²⁰ In fact, every year a certain number of St. Omers' students, having gone through their course at the college, either joined the Society of Jesus or set out for Rome or for Spain. As early as 1594 six of them, on their way southward with Fr. Baldwin, were carried off to England by pirates.²¹ Three years later the rector, Fr. John Foucart, reports to the father general of the society that eight students were sent to the Spanish seminaries. After spending several months waiting for the winds at Calais or Dunkirk, they finally reached their destination.²² The printed "*Litterae Annuae S. J.*" (or yearly reports on the work of the society), speaking of the "*Seminarium Anglicanum Audomarense*," generally notice the number of students sent to Spain or to Rome, which varies between fifteen and twenty-two.²³ These "missiones" were such an ordinary feature of college life that the Custom-book prescribes (p. 200) the manner in which those who leave the college must be treated:

"They are to dine at the table of the fathers, and receive wine and double portions of everything. One of the fathers shall accom-

¹⁹ Bruges "*Archives de l'Etat*," acquisitions, cahier 1, No. 10; beginning of a Latin prospectus of the college. See also "*Records of the English Catholics*," Vol. I., pp. 106, 107 and note; H. More, "*Hist. Prov. Angl. S. J.*," p. 246.

²⁰ Canon A. Bellesheim, "*W. Card. Allen und die englische seminäre auf dem Festlande*," 1885, pp. 251-2. The "*Constitutiones*" drawn up in 1600 for the students are clearly intended for future priests. See also note 19.

²¹ Foley, *op. cit.*, Vol. VIII., p. 1,147. Dom Bede Camm: "*In the brave days of old*;" also in the "*Revue Bénédictine*," Vol. XII. (1895), p. 318.

²² "*G. Ep.*," XXXV., fol. 319, letter of July 26, 1597. Foley, *op. cit.*, Vol. VII., p. 30.

²³ Foley, *op. cit.*, Vol. VIII., pp. 1147-1149. See *ibidem*, Vol. VIII., p. 521, a letter, dated August 17, 1610, from the rector of St. Omers recommending four "noble English youths," whom he sends to the English College, Rome, certifying "that, up to this time, they have studied Greek and Latin with remarkable proficiency." See also following note.

pany them the first night, sometimes also some of the students, if there is any special reason, as when a brother parts from his brother, all the students keep them company a short part of the way."

Yet, though St. Omers may be considered as an ecclesiastical seminary, it was one of a "mixed" character. Fr. Schondonck, in his "Responsio" of 1609, alluded to above, distinguishes among the boys two different categories, the alumni and the convictores. The former are admitted without fee. They live on the revenues of the college, and after a stay of four years are sent to the greater seminaries for their higher studies. Besides these, says Fr. Schondonck, at the request of His Majesty and of our Lord Gregory XIII. (sic) we have been obliged to take in boarders (convictores) also, with the result that the buildings, which had sufficed thus far for the alumni, could not accommodate the convictores.²⁴

The reason for this new departure from the original idea of a seminary is obvious enough—the English Catholics had no proper schools, and the best way of giving young boys a Catholic education was to send them to the seminaries already established abroad.²⁵

Thus it happened that St. Omers assumed a character similar to that of the present "petits séminaires" on the Continent, where the boys who prepare themselves for the higher clerical studies are brought up with those destined for other careers. It resembled also other early Jesuit schools, which were attended both by "scholastics" of the society and by laymen. Whatever may be thought of this system of semi-clerical education at the present day, no other workable scheme presented itself in Elizabethan times. The result of

²⁴ "Notandum alios in dicto seminario alumnos esse, alios convictores . . . In alumni requiritur plerumque aetas annorum 14, ut deinde ubi in Seminario decimum octavum annum in studiis exegerint, destinentur ad collegium Romanum, Vallisoletum et Hispalense, quibus missionibus quotannis mittuntur a Seminario plures 20." . . . "Societas, cupiente Sa. Me. Item Sanctissimo Duo Nro Gregorio XIII. (sic) suscepit curam huius Audomarensis Seminarii cum convictu eorum qui ex Anglia haereticorum educatione prudenter subtracti hic catholico ritu imbuerentur pietate, moribus, disciplinis." . . . "Cum constringat nos christiana necessitas," ut praeter alumnos admittantur quoque—convictores, opus habuit seminarium loco paulo laxiore Tametsi enim prior domus—ante sufficere visa sit alumni, deerat tamen convictoribus locus" (Responsio," 2a. oblectio; 3a. oblectio). In 1549 the boys seem to have all been "alumni." On June 19 Fr. Holt, speaking of the Roman and Spanish seminaries, says: "Cum ut ad illa seminaria postea promoveantur ideo studiosi isti in hoc formentur et alentur" ("G. Ep.," XXXV., fol. 317).

²⁵ H. More, "Hist. Prov. Angl. S. J.," p. 162. Philip II's letter to the Bishop of St. Omers recommends to him "les enfants anglois eschappes de leur pays des mains des hérétiques, qui s'efforcent les separer de leurs parents catholiques" (J. J. E. Proost, *op. cit.*, p. 300). "De quibus [pueris], ut catholicam fidem a teneris imbibant, et alios deinde eadem imbuant, parentes sunt valde solliciti, quod iam in Anglia sub omni lapide cubet (?) scorpius" (Fr. Schondonck's "Responsio," *loc. cit.*).

this naturally was that the boys were submitted to a rather strict discipline. Though receiving a training sufficiently complete to allow them to play their part in the world, yet they were constantly reminded of the high mission which in a near future their influential positions would call them upon to fulfil. "The end of the young men who are brought up in this community: . . . they have in view primarily the conversion of England, each according to his calling; for such is the reason why their friends sent them hither: first of all, that where the Catholic religion and honest living are so much shaken by Heretics, their own sons, on their return home, may stand boldly in their faith, and firm in their integrity of life; secondly, that amidst so many false teachings spread abroad in England, they may see for themselves and show to others where lies the right path; thus they mean to acquire both Piety and Learning."²⁶ What were the studies included in this latter part of the programme will be said in connection with the curriculum; suffice it to say for the present, that they corresponded to the course then called Humanities.

It has been told above how a few students from Eu settled at St. Omers in the autumn of 1592 in order to follow the lectures at the Belgian college. At a later period the English house became important enough not to depend any longer on its Walloon neighbor for the teaching of its inmates, and the connection was broken off. Thus two distinct periods are to be considered in the early history of St. Omers. It will be necessary to ascertain first of all *when* the strictly independent life of the famous college began.

Fr. H. More ("Hist. Prov. Angl. S. J.," p. 163) simply says: "Annis consequentibus, postquam domesticos intra parietes studiorum palaestra constituta est." . . . The exact date seems to be October 14, 1614.²⁷ This may be seen from two documents drawn

²⁶ From the Latin rules of the Sodality (C.-B., pp. 87, 88), partly quoted in Fr. More, "Hist. Prov. Angl. S. J.," p. 427.

²⁷ Fr. Oliver Manare, on June 19, 1594, ordains that the boys of the seminary be not punished in class at the college, but sent home and punished by their own superiors ("G. Ep.," XXXV., fol. 317). In the letter referred to in note 22 Fr. John Foucart reports (1597) that the English boys "in suis classibus fere primum locum obtinent." He asks not to be obliged to warn the Prefect of Studies of the college when he wishes to keep one of the boys at the seminary. The "Annuae Litterae S. J. anni 1598" (Lugduni, 1607), p. 239, speaking of the Walloon "Collegium Audomarense," also mention the English students as attending the lectures: "Florent in hac urbe tria Seminaría, quae scholas nostras vehementer nobilitant: . . . Tertium Anglicanum . . ." In 1600 the "Constitutiones" of the seminary recommend that the boys should go to and return from schools with the companions appointed, and not argue loudly on the way (C.-B., p. 5). Again, in the "Annuae Litterae" for 1600 (Dillingae s. a.), p. 228, we find about the "Collegium Audomarense:" Scholae nostrae "duobus florent praeclaris seminaríis, altero . . . Anglorum altero; in illo

up in view of the Annual Letters of that year. The first, from the hand of Fr. Thomas Feck, after relating the manner in which the Passion play was acted in the college church, goes on to say: "It was happily brought to pass this year that we opened schools within the precincts of our own college. The school rooms are very suitable, though not yet perfect as far as decoration and accessories are concerned."²⁸ Another proof is an account signed "J. Wilsonus," i. e., the Rev. John Wilson, a great benefactor of the college, in which is said that "on the 14th of October in the morning after Solemn Mass, the *new* schools were opened in this college."²⁹ If the reason be asked which determined the opening of the schools at that date, it might be suggested as a conjecture that the seminary precincts having been enlarged by the acquisition of a neighboring house,³⁰ there was room enough for an increase of the staff employed.

We have called the English establishment St. Omers *College*, but we are not prepared to discuss the real name which should be given to it before it constituted a wholly independent unit. According to the terminology used in the education system of the Society of Jesus, its technical name ought perhaps to be *convictus*, inasmuch as it was a boarding school,³¹ or *seminarium*, like other establishments where boys were prepared for the priesthood. In fact, it was sometimes called college, more frequently *seminarium*. This is the name generally used by the "Litterae Annuae" and by the Jesuit superiors, for instance, Fr. Manare and Fr. Foucart.

The management of the seminary in the first period, when it constituted only a boarding school depending on the greater college, cannot be clearly determined. It was a time of groping and testing, during which no permanent academic organization was possible. The sources of information, moreover, though abundant enough as regards antiquarian details, throw but little light on the internal

alumni fere 40 degunt, in hoc 120; praest istis . . . , his praefecti sunt Patres Societatis." The "Responsio" of Fr. Schondonck, written in the same year, describes the whole house without mentioning school rooms.

²⁸ "Feliciter hoc anno effectum est, ut scholas aperiremus intra proprios Collegii nostri parietes, easque valde commodas, licet nondum adsint ea quae ad ornamentum et complementum spectant . . . vi Novembris MDCXIII, Thomas Feckus" (Brussels "Archives du Royaume," Varia, S. J., carton 29). About Fr. Feck, cf. Foley, *op. cit.*, Vol. VII, pp. 247-8.

²⁹ "Die 14 Octobris mane post solemne sacrum aperiebantur in hoc collegio 'novae' scholae." The word "novae" is omitted in Foley's translation (*op. cit.*, Vol. V., p. 426) of the document, which is in the Brussels "Archives," *ibidem*.

³⁰ Abbé O. Bled, *op. cit.*, p. 552.

³¹ Rev. T. Hughes, "Loyola," p. 100. "Societas admittit quoque curam Convictorum et tum vocantur illae societatis familiae 'Collegia cum Convictu'—Ita societas—suscepit curam huius Audomarensis 'Seminarii cum Convictu'" (see note 24).

working of the house. We shall thus mention here only what is special to the seminary in its earlier Auffassung, and leave for further treatment organizations which evolved themselves and survived in the full-grown college of later days.

The first difficulty which had to be met was one connected with the higher government of the house. By his letters of 1594 Philip II. richly endowed the seminary and overruled the objections of the Magistracy to the purchase of the new collegiate buildings. Yet to quiet their fears of danger on the part of a purely English community, he ordained by the same letters that the superior of the seminary should be one born in his own dominions, "un Recteur de la nation de mes pays de par de la."³² Accordingly Fr. Flack resigned the superiorship and Fr. John Foucart, a Belgian, became rector or regent of the seminary. A natural consequence of this difference of nationality was that troubles cropped up not unlike those which disturbed other English seminaries, though of far minor consequence.

The new superior's views about education differed on some points from those of Fr. Flack and others, who feared that his more stringent discipline would deter parents from sending their children to the seminary. In his letters to superiors he urgently asks to be relieved from his charge, adding humorously, after speaking of Fr. Flack: "For all that, there is one point on which we agree, which is that he thinks and wishes that the rector or regent of this seminary should be changed."³³ We shall see, when speaking of discipline, some of the solutions given to these domestic problems. Nor were they alone to be settled. The status of the house in its relation to the Walloon college also required to be legally determined. The college itself was governed by Jesuit Fathers belonging administratively to the Province of Lower Germany properly so-called, or Belgium.³⁴ Now, at the period we are

³² See note 16. In a petition endorsed "Reasons why ye King of Spain and Infanta ordered an English Rector for the Seminary," we find the following: "No obstante las cartas que se escrivieron las 4 de Março 1594 al Governador, y al Obispo de S. Omer condescendiendo que el Rector fuesse natural dessos paises." But the writer insists that no such stipulation appeared in the patent letters of foundation. "En la carta de la fundacion fecha en Bruselas a las 6 de Mayo 1594, no ay restriction ninguna, el Rey poniendo el Seminario en la superintendencia de la Compa. de Jesus puramente sin dezir otro" (Brussels "Archives du Royaume," Varia, S. J., carton 29).

³³ "In hoc tamen ego et ipse convenimus, quod indicet et velit mutari rectorem seu regentem Seminarii huius." ("G. Ep.," XXXV., fol. 324, 6 December 1597.)

³⁴ The Province of Lower Germany, founded in 1556 by St. Ignatius, was divided, in September, 1564, by Fr. Laynez into two provinces: the Rhenish Province and that of Lower Germany proper or Belgium. On May 24, 1612, the latter was itself divided into "Provincia Flandro-Belgica" and "Pro-

speaking of the English members of the society were not yet constituted into a distinct province, but made up a "mission," governed by a prefect generally residing in Rome. Under him was a vice prefect living in England, with authority over the fathers employed in the island. Those still on the Continent, though governed by the local provincials in everything concerning domestic discipline, were subjected for the rest to the prefect in Rome, represented in Spain and Belgium by two local vice prefects.⁸⁵ A consequence of this rather complicated arrangement was that the rector of the seminary depended both on the prefect of the English mission and on the Belgian provincial. The latter, Father Oliver Manare, is the author of the first constitutional document we know about St. Omers Seminary.⁸⁶ It fixes thus the status of the superior in relation to the rector of the college: "It is just and in accordance with the common rule of the seminaries under our care, which are separated and distinct from the houses of the society, that their rector should be free in his administration and absolutely independent of the rector of our college. . . . But he shall be subject to the provincial and write to him as the rectors of the colleges do. He shall be bound to give him an account of discipline and of receipts and expenditures."⁸⁷ As regards studies, however, the English boys were to be entirely subject to the authority of the prefect of studies of the Belgian college. In a "memorial" of June 16, 1597, Fr. O. Manare, vice provincial, determined some rule to be observed in the matter. To the question: "Is it lawful for the rector of the seminary to allow the students to act a play without

vincia Gallo-Belgica," with which St. Omers Seminary was connected till 1619. (Cf. Fr. Carrez, S. J., "Atlas geographicus S. J.," pp. 5 foll.; completed from "Précis historiques," 1883, p. 420.)

⁸⁵ "Historiae S. J. Pars VI." (1616), J. Cordara (Romae s. a.), p. 199. See H. More, "Hist. Prov. Angl. S. J.," pp. 241-248; Foley, *op. cit.*, Vol. VII., pp. 60 foll., gives the list of the Prefects, Vice Prefects and Provincials; Fr. Morris, S. J., "Troubles of Our Catholic Forefathers," first series, pp. 200-201.

⁸⁶ It is a "Memorial" in the shape of a letter, dated June 19, 1594, addressed to the Fr. General ("G. Ep.," XXXV., fol. 317), asking him to approve the answers lately given by the Provincial to questions about the management of the College. Fr. O. Manare is the author of several regulations for colleges S. J., *e. g.*, of those given to the "Collegium cum convictu" of Dillingen in 1582. See "Monumenta Germaniae Paedagogica," Vol. II., pp. 263-264. See also Sommervogel, "Bibliothèque de la Cie de Jesus," Vol. II., col. 456-459.

⁸⁷ *Justum est et cosentaneum usul communi Seminariorum, quorum curam gerimus, et quae separata et seluncta sunt ab aedibus societatis, ut Rector eorum libere administret, neque dependeat ulla in he a Rectore Collegii nostri; conferret tamen ut in dubiis et incidentibus difficultatibus ipsum consulat, non externam aliquem, nisi eodem Rectore Collegii conscio. Dependeat autem a Praeposito Provinciali et ad ipsum scribat ut rectores collegiorum, elque visitanti teneatur reddere rationem disciplinae, ac dati atque accepti."*

leave from the rector of the college?" he answered: "That must on no account be allowed to the superior, lest we might seem to put up altar against altar; for, although the jurisdiction does not depend on that of the rector, yet the direction of studies must be one and the same for all and for both communities."⁸⁸ Nor were private academic exhibitions to be given at the seminary without the agreement of the college authorities. "May orations, recitations and dialogues be held by our students at home privately or in the refectory?—Nor is that lawful; and experience teaches clearly that these exercises, both on account of their frequency and of the levity which they produce and foster in the students, are very harmful to their studies and literary training; therefore, that nothing be done in this line without leave of the prefect and even of the rector of the college, to whom we think fit that the regent of the seminary should defer in this matter. We do not forbid, however, that some short poem be composed to welcome and honour some grave men who may come to the college; but we think in the Lord that this also must seldom be done, and that this burdensome politeness must not be used for every nobleman."⁸⁹

Another decision on the same subject may here be quoted as alluding to an interesting custom: "On the feast of Corpus Christi, when the procession passes by the seminary, or during the octave, is it not lawful for our boys to recite some poems in the form of dialogue, in honour of the Blessed Sacrament, without the consent either of the rector of the college or of the prefect of studies?—That must not be done either, for this pious homage has been suppressed in many other places on account of disorder, and it is not becoming that the people, following the Blessed Sacrament with great reverence, be distracted by these exhibitions. Another practice might be allowed, viz., that when the Blessed Eucharist draws near two English students, standing at some distance, should recite ten or twelve verses by way of welcome and greeting. These verses should be very suggestive and full of feeling, such as would move to tears and devotion; but they must also be first examined by the prefect of

⁸⁸ "Nullo facto id permittendum est regenti, ne videamur altare contra altare erigere: licet enim non dependeat ejus iurisdictio ex iurisdictione Rectoris, oeconomica tamen litteraria debet esse una et communis omnibus et utrique familiae" ("G. Ep.," XXXV., fol. 318, 16 iunii 1597).

⁸⁹ Neque hoc licet, et experientia manifeste docet has exercitationes tum ob frequentiam, tum ob levitatem quam inde hauriunt et induunt studiosi, multum nocere ipsorum studiis ac profectui litterario; proinde nihil fiat horum nisi consentiente Praefecto et Rectore ipso Collegii, cui hac in re a Regente Seminarii deferendum ducimus. Non impedimus tamen quin possint brevi aliquo epigrammate excipi, et cohonestari viri aliqui graves, qui ad Collegium interdum aliunde veniunt; sed et istud rarum esse debere indicamus in Domino, neque quemvis nobilem cohonestandum hoc officio et onere" (*ibid.*).

studies and the regent with his consultors; and when those of the college recite something, let nothing be heard from the seminary."⁴⁰

The power of the prefect of studies extended even to minor details. Thus the rector of the seminary was bound to warn him whenever he decided for some good reason to keep one of the boys from going to schools.⁴¹

Apart from the question of studies the seminary constituted a complete unit. Its own spiritual life was from the first independent. In 1594 Fr. O. Manare, considering that "the house they inhabit is far from the college and has its own chapel,"⁴² in which ours celebrate," granted leave to administer the sacraments to all the inmates and to recite Vespers at home. Thus the students "will not be obliged to waste time and get disturbed by walking through the streets more often than is necessary." Catechism might also be taught at home.⁴³ We learn from Fr. Schondonck's "Responsio" that the English seminary had its own music masters, but the legislation on the matter does not seem to have been fixed till the era of independence.

Interior discipline required more immediate consideration. It was intrusted to three "prefects," each of them having under his special care one of the three large rooms into which the boys were distributed.⁴⁴ In the beginning the *lex caritatis* was the only safeguard of good behavior, but the necessity of corporal punishment soon suggested itself. The power of chastising the boys, which first belonged to the "minister" only, was later extended to the three prefects. This, however, was one of the points on which Fathers

⁴⁰ "Similiter in festo Corporis Xl., dum supplicatio per nos transit, vel infra octavam, nostris pueris non liceat foemata aliqua recitare per modum dialogi in laudem Venerabilis Sacramenti, nisi habito super hoc consensu vel P. Rectoris collegii vel Praefecti Studiorum. Neque hoc fiat, nam ob abusum hoc pietatis officium sublatum est multis aliis in locis, neque decet populum sequentem magna cum veneratione SS. Sacramentum, distrali actionibus talibus. Secus esset si accedentem Sacratissimam Eucharistiam duo Angli eminus exciperent et consalutarent decem vel duodecim versibus tantum, valde emphaticis et affectuosis qui lacrymas excitent et devotionem; sed et hos versus prius examinet Praefectus studiorum et regens cum consultoribus suis; sed quo die Collegium aliquid recitat, omnino sileat Seminarium" (*ibid.*).

⁴¹ "Memorial" of Fr. Manare, quoted above; see also note 27.

⁴² Fr. Manare ("Memorial" of 1597) had not allowed the seminary to open a public chapel, but only a private oratory, which was not to be "iuxta plateam, ne paulo post occasio quaeratur operiendae portae." Later, in 1606, the Provincial allowed them to open a chapel for the benefit of the English, very numerous in the town, especially since the peace of 1604. ("Litterae ammae S. J. anni 1606" (Moguntiae, 1618), p. 650; Abbé O. Bled, *op. cit.*, p. 550.) Of the boys' chapel, and the public church opened in 1610, more will be said in a future article, when speaking of the collegiate buildings.

⁴³ Letter of 1594, quoted above.

⁴⁴ Fr. Foucart's letter of July, 1597 ("G. Ep.," XXXV., fol. 319).

Flack, Holt and Walpole could not agree with Fr. Foucart. Some time in 1597 three of the younger boys had plotted to go and beat another during the night. They were caught in the act and birched; whereupon the English fathers appealed to the vice provincial, but with no success, since the former decisions were maintained.⁴⁵ At the same time, it is worth noticing that the students of the seminary enjoyed a privilege in the matter, which was also shared by those of other seminaries under the care of the society: they were not to be punished in the schools like other boys for their shortcomings and faults unless the offense had been public and scandalous, as in the case of open rebellion. But, as a rule, they were to be sent home after the lecture to be chastised by their rector or prefect.⁴⁶ In spite of endeavors on the part of the prefect of studies and masters to bring them under the common rule, their charter of franchise, given in 1594 by Fr. Manare, was renewed in 1597.⁴⁷

Such are the scanty details we have been able to collect on the first organization of St. Omers Seminary. We hope to speak at no distant date of the management of the college in its full development, when the rules and customs had been formulated and codified in the Custom-book by Fr. Giles Schondonck.

L. WILLAERT, S. J.

Louvain, Belgium.

⁴⁵ "Disciplina domestica in dies melior, ad quam servandam et stabilendam conferet, uti iam coepimus experiri, praelectis datam potestatem corrigendi suos, maxime parvulos, qua antea erat penes solum P. Ministrum" (letter from Fr. Toncart, July 26, 1597, quoted above). "P. Vice-Provin- (letter from Fr. Toucart, July 26, 1597, quoted above). "P. Vice-Provin- potestatem habeant suos quibus praesunt, corrigendi pro defectibus" (letter from the same, December 4, 1597. "G. Ep., XXXV., fol. 322).

⁴⁶ "Habeatur magna eius ratio quod talis sit communis usus Seminariorum quorum curam gerit Societas, ut non corripiantur pro delictis eb defectibus in scholis suis, nisi publice in scholis scandalose peccarent, ut si adversus praeceptorem scandalose proutervi essent . . . Communiter autem remittantur corripiendi post lectiones ad Rectorem seu Praefectum Seminarium" (Fr. O. Manare, letter of June 19, 1594, quoted above).

⁴⁷ "Unum est quod Reverentia Vestra scire velim . . . , agi a Praefecto Studiorum ac praeceptoribus, ut nostri alumni indifferenter ut ceteri scholastici pro defectibus et negligentis castigentur in scholis" (Fr. Foucart to the Assistant of Germany, 26th July, 1597; "G. Ep., XXXV., fol. 320). "Pater Vice-Provincialis (Fr. O. Manare) . . . ordinavit—de castigatione alumnorum in scholis nihil immutandum ab eo quod iam 'ante triennium' statuerat" (same to same, 4th December, 1597, quoted above).

AN OLD MIRACLE AND MODERN SCIENCE.

“IN THE city of Naples they believe in and support one of the wretchedest of all the religious impostures one can find in Italy—the miraculous liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius. Twice a year the priests assemble all the people at the Cathedral and get out this phial of clotted blood and let them see it slowly dissolve and become liquid; and every day for eight days this dismal farce is repeated, while the priests go among the crowd and collect money for the exhibition. The first day the blood liquefies in forty-seven minutes—the church is full then, and time must be allowed the collectors to get around; after that it liquefies a little quicker and a little quicker every day as the houses grow smaller, till on the eighth day, with only a few dozen present to see the miracle, it liquefies in four minutes.” So wrote our amusing literary entertainer, Mark Twain.¹

After careful inquiry and even personal observation, to judge from the details given, he calmly and conscientiously charges the venerable clergy and civic fathers of Naples with a wretched imposture done in the name of religion, and to mark his abhorrence of the whole performance and to incite in his numerous readers the same feeling he uses language the most insinuating and insulting at his fertile command. Before his time another literary star of a very different magnitude, “le savant et sage” Addison, testified: “I had twice an opportunity of seeing the operation of this pretended miracle, and must confess I think it is so far from being a real miracle that I look upon it as one of the most bungling tricks I ever saw,”² and Voltaire, taking a utilitarian view, remarks that though a false miracle and useless prodigy, it seems to keep those excitable people, the Neapolitans, in some restraint seeing such visible signs of their being under the hand of the Divinity. This observation excited one of his editors, M. Beuchot, to add sternly in a note that such superstitions were not as indifferent to him as to M. Voltaire, because the charlatan priest who works the fraud can excite at pleasure seditions among the people, and so place the government of Naples in subjection to the clergy.³

Another romancer, Dumas père, recounts in a style not surpassed by “*Les Trois Mousquetaires*” in interest, vivacity and inaccuracy as to facts, how the miracle was worked to order by command of the French General Championnet in 1799.⁴ But why

¹ “*The Innocents Abroad*,” chap. xxix.

² “*Book of Travels Through Several Parts of Italy*,” etc., London, 1706.

³ “*Essai sur les Moeurs de l’Italie*,” chap clxxxiii.

⁴ “*Corricolo*,” Paris, 1865, Vol. I., p. 267.

enumerate here any more witnesses to the reality of the humbug? More must be summoned later, but leaving aside Voltaire as open to suspicion and Dumas as a mere writer of good copy, what abler judges could we have than Addison and Mark Twain, honorable men, and they have examined and pronounced condemnation? What remains to be said? It is true that men like Baronius,⁵ Papebrock,⁶ Vico,⁷ Sir Humphrey Davy,⁸ Hurter,⁹ Fergola¹⁰ saw it and marveled. It is true that for a "bungling trick" and "dismal farce" it has a very long run. It is true also that if it be an imposture, all the Archbishops and clergy of Naples for centuries and centuries have been rogues, and the Italian Church, and implicitly the whole Catholic Church, has tolerated for ages this outrage on God and humanity. Not one honest man among them to rise up, give away and denounce the fraud! It appears an interesting question, no matter how it is regarded, and as the writer happened to be in Naples last May he determined to linger there long enough to see "the miracle of St. Januarius" with his own eyes, to hear and to read all he conveniently could concerning this saint, who though dead yet speaketh, and concerning his mysterious blood, which seems to refuse to die. "*Ohne Glauben und ohne Unglauben*," like Hurter, neither believing nor disbelieving, but in a decidedly critical state of mind, he watched the "performance," made some inquiries, read a number of books and pamphlets and took a few notes, and now he lays the condensed results before his readers as a court of appeal, only asking—a superfluous asking—that judgment be suspended until the case has been stated and the final conclusion reached.

WHO WAS ST. JANUARIUS?

St. Januarius was Bishop of Benevento and was put to death under Diocletian in 305. The year of his birth is not known. Some acts of dubious critical value give it as 272. Tradition, supported by some very old statues, has always represented him as in the early bloom of manhood. His mother died a few days before

⁵ "Annales," ad an. 305.

⁶ Bollandists. Under date September 19; referred to afterwards by (B). They give about 130 pages to the saint and the miracle. Papebroch and Henschius were sent to Italy. Martii, tome I, p. 33.

⁷ "Il Miracolo di S. Gennaro," 3 edit., Nap., 1903, p. 21.

⁸ Dr. Weedall wrote letters from Naples to *The Catholic Mag. and Rev.*, 1831-32, p. 96. They are interesting and convincing. In "Davy's Life and Works," 9 vols. and 2 vols., edited by his brother, no mention of it occurs. It is said he requested permission to analyze it, and also that he had a leaning towards the miracle.

⁹ Quoted later.

¹⁰ "Historica Demonstratio," etc., Naples, 1634, pp. 3, 4.

his martyrdom, no mention being made of old age on her part. The saint was probably of noble extraction, as the address of his judge goes to prove, *audiens opinionem generis tui*. Until near 1632 there was no controversy about his birthplace having been Naples. The Bollandists accept it. In a sermon preached before a large crowd at Naples in that year, a "vir quidam religiosus" affirmed that Benevento was the saint's native city. "Quae" continues Caraccioli, "profecto acerba et auribus molestissima ἀντιστοιχεία auditorum fremitum merito excitavit et paulo post amicorum hortatio me permovit ut furculum istum a majore planta divelleram."¹¹ So like many an author induced by his friends he published a work which fairly settled if it did not kill the doubt. He excused the preacher and put the blame on Paolo Regio,¹² that writer of lesser people and only in name royal, but otherwise plebeian in mind and style. Gentle amenities of literature! David Romano¹³ adhered to Regio, and these two were the *puppis et prora* of the Beneventian opinion. One answer to an argument is characteristic of the time. Regio points to the house of the saint's mother still standing in Benevento. Caraccioli replies the house is not ancient enough. Even if it were, his mother may have lived there when her son was Bishop, but anyhow why was it not turned into a church, as was usual in those days? When Regio and Romano appealed to the custom of the early Church of appointing Bishops from the native clergy they had an argument of considerable force, but there were exceptions enough to weaken its strength.¹⁴ The fact that Neapolitans claimed and obtained without any difficulty the body of the Bishop of Benevento while the remains of two of his subjects and fellow martyrs were carried to Benevento, their native city, is one of the strongest arguments in favor of Naples.¹⁵

HIS MARTYRDOM.

In 303 Diocletian, while in Nicomedia, issued an edict against the Christians, and Maximinian followed suit. Aulus Timotheus, appointed consul in succession to Dracontius in August, 305, came to Nola determined to persecute this *genus hominum superstitionis*

¹¹ "Le Vite de Sette Santi protettori si Napoli," Naples, 1579.

¹² "De Septem Sanctis patronis urbis Neapolitanic," 1571.

¹³ Benevento itself had Greeks, Lombards, etc., for Bishops. St. Januarius II. B. of Benevento in 347, was from Africa. It is suggested the house may have been his. St. Paulinus of Nola was a Frenchman. B. Nov. I., p. 244.

¹⁴ "Memorie sui Fatti della Vita—di S. Gennaro," by Raffale M. Coppola, Nap., 1857. He mentions a law of Augustus, confirmed by Diocletian, permitting the bodies of those condemned to death to be buried by their relations, the *familiare funus*, Lib. 9, de offic. Procons.

¹⁵ "Roman Breviary," June 15, records similar ingratitude shown to St. Vitus by Diocletian.

novae et maleficae (Suetonius) to the utmost, and our saint, being conspicuous by his position and his intrepid assistance to the imprisoned faithful, among them his friend Sosius, was soon seized and brought before Timotheus at Nola, who declared he had heard the name of his family and exhorted him to sacrifice to the gods, threatening in case of refusal the cruelest tortures. In vain he raged and in vain he tortured. Cast into a fiery furnace, the Bishop came forth unhurt. Then he was racked and finally, along with Festus, his deacon, and Desiderius, his lector, both of Benevento, harnessed to a chariot, they drew their judge to Pozzuoli, and here they were put into a prison in which were the above mentioned Sosius, of Misena; Proculus, a deacon of Pozzuoli, and two laymen, Eutyches and Acutuius, all alike condemned *ad bestias*.

Next day they were exposed in the amphitheatre, but the wild animals forgot their ferocity and lay at the feet of the martyrs. Attributing this as usual to magic, Timotheus sentenced them to the axe, and the story runs that he was immediately struck blind, and so remained until St. Januarius by his prayers restored his sight. This miracle converted many of the bystanders, but their conversion alarmed the tyrant, fearful of losing the Emperor's favor, and he ungratefully ordered them to be executed.¹⁶ They were led to the Solfatara, and there gave their lives for their faith in the crucified God. The ruins of the amphitheatre are still extensive, and both they, and especially the Solfatara, the *Forum Vulcani* of Strabo, are interesting on many accounts. Some acts state that on the same day the cruel judge, Timotheus, suffered fearful torments and cried again and again: "O, miserable me, how I am tortured on account of that servant of God, Januarius!" and soon died.¹⁷ There is doubtless some of the "luxuriant mediæval vegetation" about many of the acts of this saint, but it is sufficient for our purpose to point out that on good historic grounds it can be accepted as a fact that St. Januarius, Bishop of Benevento, was put to death as a Christian at the Solfatara about the year 305.

BURIAL AND TRANSLATIONS.

He was buried not far from the scene of his conflict, between the Solfatara and the sea at a place then called Marcion's farm, where now stands a church in the saint's name and a convent inhabited by Capuchins. According to Tutini,¹⁸ in 325 or later,

¹⁶ Taken mainly from the "Roman Breviary," September 19. Disputed points are mostly omitted or only conclusions given in the historical part of this account, and only interesting or important authorities given.

¹⁷ Tutini, "Memorie istoriche della vita e culto di S. GIANUARIO," 1633, ed. 1710.

¹⁸ Caraccioli, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

according to the Bollandists in 381, his remains were solemnly transferred by Bishop John, or Saint Severus, to a church built close to the walls of Naples and near that of St. Fortunatus. Here it remained until shortly after 817, when Sico, Duke of Benevento, having besieged Naples apparently without decisive result, took the martyr's body, in those days no mean prize, and withdrew to his own city *onustus tamen sacra et invidenda praeda*.¹⁹ Quite a difference between this Duke and one of his later successors, Talleyrand! The church in which the body was kept becoming old and dilapidated, it was transferred in 1129 under Gualter, Archbishop of Tarentino, then also ruler of Benevento, to the new church erected by himself for the Saints Festus and Desiderius. During the same stormy century, under either Frederick Barbarossa or his successor, the body was secretly conveyed to the abbey of Monte Vergine and there interred in the centre of the church and a high altar constructed over the spot for greater security, and then it seems it was gradually lost sight of until John (Cardinal), of Arragon, who held the abbey *in commendam*, wished to renovate the church, and the high altar having been removed from the centre, the relics were found. Soon after John died, and Cardinal Oliver Carafa had the abbey, to whom King Ferdinand wrote asking the body to be restored to Naples. After much delay, owing to wars, Pope Alexander VI. gave Alexander Carafa, Archbishop of Naples and Oliver's brother, permission to remove the body, which was done January 13, 1497, and the plague then raging at Naples ceased.

ANCIENT AUTHORITIES.

The name of St. Januarius, Bishop and martyr, is found in the "Life of St. Paulinus of Nola," a client of his, who died in 431, written in 432 by the priest Uranius. The martyrologies of Jerome and of Carthage of the fifth century mention him and those of Ado, Notker and Usuard. Martyrologies, as well known, give only dates and place of suffering, and not the details. Venerable Bede, who sleeps in such simple state in Durham's wondrous fane, gives his eulogium ad 13 kal. oct. The Greek Menologium, compiled in the tenth century by order of the Emperor Basil, honors the saint and his companions on the same day, September 19. The Greeks had special reverence for Januarius. There are numerous Acta, the principal being those used by the Bollandists, which are very probably the most ancient, dating from about the end of the fourth century, as the first translation of the holy Bishop's remains, *i. e.*, from near the Solfatara to the neighborhood of the city, had not yet taken place: the Acta Bonensiana, whose claims to priority were so stoutly

¹⁹ "Vindiciae-Actor, Bonoru," S. Jan., Nap., 1759.

maintained by Mazzocchi;²⁰ the *Acta Vaticana*, or *Baroniana*, and others.²¹ John the Deacon, a Neapolitan and historian of the Bishops of Naples, wrote some during the tenth century. There is some disagreement among many of these authorities as to the month in which the saint suffered, but at present in Naples the celebration in September is in honor of his death, that of May in remembrance of the translation, and on December the 16th is the feast of his patronage. Of later mentions no need to speak, nor of the numerous lives and discussions concerning the miracle, enough to form a small library.

HONORS PAID THE SAINT.

The high esteem and great affection in which the Neapolitans have always held their renowned patron, and his favors to them in return are abundantly shown by many public and historical monuments. Apart from the church erected over his tomb near the Forum Vulcani, and a second near the city to which his remains were removed, there was a third in the city called St. Januarius in Diaconia, and later often ad Ulmum, built as early as 680. Here John the Deacon was stationed. A fourth with the dramatic name (but prosaic explanation) St. Januarius spolians mortuos in vico Judaeorum is now called St. Mary of the Angels. A chapel stands on the hill Antignano commonly spoken of as S. Gennarello al Vomero, and there is a second one near by containing the stone upon which the saint's head was carried from the Solfatara district. Near Torre del Greco a church was erected in 1632 in gratitude for deliverance from injury during the eruption of Mount Vesuvius the year preceding. At Capo di Monte there is a little chapel. In the surrounding districts there are churches and chapels, and in the city itself many statues and other monuments to the saint, while medals have also been struck from time to time in his honor, some of which with Latin and Greek inscriptions go back one thousand years.²² In 1738 the Order of St. Januarius was instituted by

²⁰ Falconio gives many acts, etc., in his large work, "*L'Intera Istoria del glorioso Martira S. Gennaro, Intera.*" Indeed, starting from Janus the two-faced and bringing in Javan, son of Japhet, from whom he traces the Januarian families. Having finished this learned, laborious and useless task, he writes with complacency: "Avendo scorso un pelago d'oscurissime antichità. Non sommersivi come gli altro." Yet his book is useful.

²¹ Tutini claims earliest medals to be of 660, which Mabillon and the Bollandists contest. The Bollandists omit one of the two chapels on the hill Antignano.

²² Not the first of the name, as there was another so called, dating back to the building of the present cathedral, in the early fourteenth century. "Eccoci alla famosissima Capella detta del Tesoro, superbo e non perituro monumento della magnificenza de' Napoletani e loro plissimo affetto verso

Charles III., and the first cavaliers named were the Emperors of Austria and of Russia, the Kings of France, Bavaria, Denmark, Prussia, Sardinia, Saxony, etc.

The Cathedral itself, dedicated to Our Lady, was often called by his name, and is so still in many guide books, though there is no proof that it was ever dedicated to the saint. But in it are two chapels in his honor. One commonly called the *sub-corpus*, or *succorpo*, under the high altar, is a beautiful piece of work designed by Thomas Malvita di Como. The floor, ceiling, altars, statues and stairs are in Parian marble, and here lies in a bronze sarcophagus the body of the saint since 1506. The other, called "The Treasury of St. Januarius," is the fourth on your left as you enter the main door, and this is one of the richest and finest chapels in the world.²³ Vowed by the city in 1527, it was not begun until 1608, according to the plans of Grimaldi the Theatine. Artists vied with one another to be employed in its adorning. Many a strange story is told of them and their rivalry. Guido had to flee for his life on account of the Greek, Belisar Conenzio, likewise the Chevalier l'Arpino, while poor Dominichino was said to have died of chagrin over a trick played by a bribed workman so that his frescoes might quickly fade. The magnificent bronze gates are by Fansaga. The interior, with its seven fine altars, its precious marbles, its numerous glistening silver statues, its glowing frescoes, lofty and elegant ceiling, forms a gorgeous picture, and here behind the high altar, in two niches closed with solid silver doors, are preserved the head of the saint and the phials containing the world-famed and much discussed blood. Let us call it blood for the present. Even if it be not blood, it is one of the strangest and most puzzling substances in the world. And now, having seen briefly the historical view of the saint and of his cult, an attempt will be made to state clearly how the case concerning the head and blood stands at present, giving the main points in its history, the principal phenomena and the corresponding scientific difficulties.

"IL MIRACOLO DI SAN GENNARO."

What is the miracle? When a phial containing, it is said, his S. Gennaro. E. Meritamente fu addimandata del Tesoro ove si consideri che, a prescindere della prodigiosa quantità che vi si serba di gioie, di vasi sacri d'oro e d'argento, di statue e busti d'argento e di sontuosi apparati necessari al divin culto, evvi il deposito del prodigioso sangue e del Capo del Santo Vescovo, prezioso tesoro, perenne fonte dal quale tutte le grazie fluiscano che. Dio giornalmente si degna concedere a questa popolosa e cospicua Metropoli ad intercessione di sì gran Protettore!"—"Notizie del Bello, dell'Antico e del Curioso di Napoli," by Carlo Celano, edit. by G. B. Chiarmi, Nap., 1856.

²³ The account of the money paid "to our well beloved, our royal goldsmith," is still preserved in Reg. Ann. 130, fol. 115.

own blood is presented to the head of St. Januarius, the blood, dry and hard in appearance, becomes liquid; hence the expression the liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius.

STORY OF THE HEAD AND BLOOD.

At what date the head was first preserved separately from the body is not known. Probably, as customary, it was buried with the body. At the removal of the latter to the new church outside the walls it may have been brought to the principal church of the city. There is no doubt but that when Duke Sico took the body to Benevento the head remained in Naples. In 1305 or 6 Charles II., of Anjou, a "pious and religious King," as Chioccarelli terms him, caused a life-sized bust of silver, gilt, to be made, in which was inclosed the saint's skull, and in this it has ever since reposed.²⁴ That it was the custom of Christians to gather the blood of martyrs we know from history and the little crystal bottles so often found in the Catacombs. Who gathered our saint's blood is unknown, though, according to one tradition, it was his old nurse, and according to another, a devout woman of Naples. At first likely buried (B), the blood was afterwards preserved along with the head, but there is no documentary reference to it until the year 1140, when the "Chronicle of Maraldus" records that King Roger of Sicily visited Naples and saw the miracle.²⁵ In the fifteenth century Lupo di Specchio told the story of St. Peregrinus, so named probably from his numerous pilgrimages, who was at Naples between 1100 and 1120 and mentions the blood, which is spoken of also in connection with the visits of Charles I. at the end of the thirteenth and Charles II. at the beginning of the fourteenth century. A manuscript of 1399 speaks of a chapel wherein were guarded the head and blood. The Journal of Julian Passero narrates that October 6, 1496, the blood was fluid like water, and Robert Gaguin, or the author of "Les Chroniques de France," describes how Charles VIII. "Dimanche Troisième jour du Mois de Mai ouit sa messe à Sainet Genny" and saw the liquefied blood. Mulcassen, Bey of Tunis, saw it in 1547 and became a convert. To Baronius it was a standing miracle, and Benedict XIV. defends it as a true and great miracle which has not one or two witnesses, but all Italy, or, more correctly, the whole Christian world. It would be tedious to enumerate all the sovereigns and eminent men who have seen it and have been impressed by it. In our own times it was observed by Victor Emmanuel, the Emperor of Russia (in

²⁴ Butler's "Lives of the Saints," September 19.

²⁵ St. Peregrinus was the son of St. Margaret of Scotland and Malcolm III., the king who punished Macbeth.

1873), Pope Pius IX., King Humbert and Queen Marguerite, ex-Queen Natalie of Servia, Queen Amalie of Portugal, etc.

TIME OF THE FIRST LIQUEFACTION.

When the blood first liquefied is not known with certainty. There is a tradition declaring that when the remains were taken in solemn procession from the Solfatara to Naples, the woman who had gathered the martyr's blood, or a descendant of hers, offered to the Bishop the phial which had been preserved in her home.²⁶ This presentation took place on the hill of Antignano, and as soon as the phial was brought near the relics the dry blood immediately liquefied and bubbled. In memory of this a church was built on the spot, and on its walls there is a tablet, erected or renewed in the seventeenth century, which commemorates the miracle. The first author apparently who mentions this meeting and liquefaction is Paolo Reggio, who wrote in 1571, and he cites no documentary authority. If the miracle took place then and there, it is rather strange, seeing that liquefactions of the blood of saints, though known, are very rare, that the Acts and early homilies in honor of the saint omit such a remarkable occurrence.²⁷ An eulogium written in or before the ninth century mentions it not, neither does John the Deacon, who, writing in the same age, brings his account down to 872. This omission is a great obstacle to the acceptance of the tradition, yet it can be said that otherwise the tradition has some points in its favor.²⁸ There are grounds for placing it about the eleventh century, and not later, if we accept the life of St. Peregrinus mentioned before, which states that when this saint visited Naples, 1100 to 1120, the miracle was then well known, and some authors quote the "Chronicle of Maraldus" as authority for the statement that King Roger in 1140 declared he came to Naples after his coronation not so much to receive the homage of his subjects as to venerate the *redivivus sanguis* so well known even in distant lands.²⁹ Moreover, there is such a noted increase in devotion to St. Januarius about the eleventh and twelfth centuries,

²⁶ Caraccioli writes of an antique image of a woman with an ampulla over the door of the old Church of St. Januarius, near the city.

²⁷ Tutini, Summonte ("Historia della Città di Napoli," 1675), Capaccio ("Neapolitanae Historiae," t. I., p. 760, Naples, 1607).

²⁸ "The Breve Chronicon Monasterii St. Stephani de Nemore," attributed to Maraldus, is listed among opacryphul or dubious ones by Barth. Capasso in his "Le Fonti della Storia delle Province Napolitane dal 568-1500," Naples, 1902, p. 90.

²⁹ In the ninth century St. Januarius was not the principal patron, though he is mentioned alone in the sixth by Peter the Notary, but he is in the twelfth. Beneficed priests had to visit yearly the *limina Beati Januariae*.—II Formulario of Archbishop Umberto, of date 1308.

during which the Cathedral was called after him, that it can be attributed to some striking manifestation of his power.³⁰ During these centuries Naples produced no chroniclers or historians, and it is noteworthy that no later writers till Reggio attempt to specify the time when the liquefactions began. It is reasonable to conclude that this peculiar phenomenon has been occurring for nigh a thousand years at least.

WHERE THE HEAD AND BLOOD ARE PRESERVED.

Sunk in the thickness of the solid external wall behind the high altar in the chapel of St. Januarius commonly called *Il Tesoro*, there are two cupboards side by side, but not communicating with one another and having no opening but the doors. Each measures about three feet four inches in height, two feet in width and sixteen inches in depth. The walls are covered with damask and are of wood (colored marble, Professor Punzo) except the dividing one between the two, which is of metal, and the flooring of silver. The doors of silver have each two strong locks, four in all, of which one is in the upper part and one in the lower part of each door. The keys, four in number, are kept, the two for the upper locks in the custody of the Archbishop, the two for the lower in the custody of the representatives of the city, whose president is always the Mayor. In the cupboard or recess to the left as you face the wall is the bust of St. Januarius, in the head of which is his skull or its bones; in the other to the right is a case made of silver and glass containing the two ampullae or phials. This reliquary is circular in form, somewhat resembling an extra large flat watch case, with a width of about five inches and a depth of two, and has glass behind and before. On the top, where the ring of a watch would be, there is an ornamental projection surmounted by an elliptical crown with a crucifix rising up through it. On the opposite side is a hollow cylindrical handle about six inches long and one in diameter, by which the reliquary is carried in the hands or set in a rich silver stand like an ostensorium or monstrance when it is to be placed on the altar or carried in procession. This reliquary or *teca*, as it is often called, is thought to have been presented also by Charles II. of Anjou, or by his son Robert, as the workmanship is of that period and it bears the royal arms.

The phials are of crystal and like those gathered from martyrs' tombs or like the lachrymatories of the ancients. They are kept in an upright position by being fixed at the ends in a glue of a lemon color, and each phial is so closed that when the liquid fills

³⁰ The opinion that the blood was buried with the body, but removed at least before Duke Sico's attack in 817, has great probability.

the phial or it is inverted not a drop can escape. The smaller phial is round in form and measures say three inches in length and less than two-thirds of an inch in diameter. The larger one, in shape like a flattened pear, is about three inches and a half in length, two inches in width and perhaps an inch where thickest.³¹ They are plain except for a slight wavy ring of glass around the neck of both, and around the smaller one a little lower down four straighter rings extra. The phials are about half an inch from the glass sides of the case, so they do not touch them at all; neither do they touch the silver part, except maybe at the top and bottom. The glass sides have plain surfaces, as can be seen by turning the case, because the phials retain to the eye their size and form.

EXPOSITION OF THE RELICS.

On the Saturday preceding the first Sunday in May, 1904, at noon a representative of the Archbishop and one of the city met before the recesses, each bearing a gold embroidered velvet bag containing two keys, one for each door. The bust was first taken out, placed at the Gospel side of the altar and clothed by the chaplains with very costly episcopal vestments—mitre, stole, cape, chain and cross—and then it was carried in procession to the Church of Santa Chiara and there deposited on the same side of the high altar. About 5 in the evening the other recess was opened with the same precautions and the reliquary carried in solemn procession by the Metropolitan Chapter, arrayed in full canonical robes, and the chaplains of the "Treasury," clad in their official garments, accompanied by the body of noble deputies, members of religious congregations, etc., preceded by about fifty groups of four men carrying on elevated platforms the silver statues or busts of the principal patron saints of the city, through the decorated and crowded streets to the same grand old Church of St. Clare, whose corner-stone was laid by King Robert in 1310. There, amidst a crowd that overflowed into every nook and cranny of the building, each statue was brought and paused for a moment as in homage before the right regal looking bust of St. Januarius, and at each pause a versicle and response were chanted. It was impressive. The statues are remarkably lifelike and striking in their attitudes and varied picturesque habits or vestments, and as they come in sight, gleaming high over the heads of the multitude, the verse of the Hebrew Psalmist would come unbidden to mind: *Nimis honorati sunt amici tui Deus*, and the words of the Magnificat, *exultavit humiles*, were

³¹ Boldetti, "Osservazioni Sopra i Sagri Climiteri," p. 155, has an engraving very like this large phial.

illustrated even on earth, for truly it was an exaltation of the humble. St. Januarius was holding court. It makes a splendid scene and leaves a lifelong remembrance. Finally the reliquary came in sight last of all, borne in the hands of the Archbishop, Cardinal Prisca, who slowly made his way through the fast filling sanctuary and by the Royal Cuirassiers in brazen helmets, who with drawn swords kept order, and up the steps to the altar, where, turning around and holding the teca up, he showed the blood to the people. It was hard and dry. Then prayers were said by the clergy and the Cardinal held the case slightly elevated, now and then almost inverting it, while an attendant at times held up a single candle to enable him to see if the hard mass showed any sign of change. No sign yet. More prayers are recited by the priests, while *la gente* of St. Januarius raised their voices in still higher invocations. An indescribable air of expectancy pervaded the whole vast assemblage and kept them gazing as one man on the relic in the hands of the Archbishop. Suddenly he looks closer, and lo! the mass is moving. It is liquid, bubbling. A sigh of relief and joy escapes from the crowd. Once more St. Januarius has manifested his power, and now the triumphant "Te Deum" rings out through the lofty vaulted church. The Cardinal kisses the reliquary and those around press closely. Bishops, canons, chaplains, laymen, natives and strangers, all mixed, and all seemingly without exception salute the fluid blood, and the people outside the rails come in turn, all anxious to have the same privilege. About 9 o'clock the solemn procession winds its way back through the crowded and joyous streets to the Cathedral, and the bust and the phials are restored carefully and according to rules in vogue for a couple of centuries to their honored tabernacles.²²

Naturally such a sight, so historic, solemn and unusual, may fill the spectator's mind and interfere some with critical observation; but the succeeding day, Sunday, in the Cathedral, and during the remainder of the octave in the chapel itself, the exposition takes place, and consequently an abundance of opportunities is offered to every one. The writer went twice more to see the liquefaction in the morning and once towards evening to see the way of pro-

²² The chapel of the treasury being civic property, Pope Innocent X. sent, in 1647, a delegate, afterwards Clement X., to draw up a compact regulating the rights of the Archbishop and of the city, and making regulations regarding the number and ceremonies of the expositions. Ten Neapolitan nobles, with two representatives elected by the city, constituted the civic deputies of the chapel. They are now appointed by the king, and likewise the chaplains, twelve in number. Before the exposition an exhibition is held in the sacristy of the chalices, crowns, mitres, etc., presented in honor of the saint by Popes, kings and others. One mitre contains 3,325,168 rubies and 188 emeralds.—Sperindeo.

cedure. A crowd every morning and all during the day some people going and coming, and all who wish may approach to see or to kiss the relic. Each morning as a rule the blood is hard, and the liquefaction occurs again. The time required on Saturday was five minutes; on the second occasion, seven, and on the third twenty. But there are other phenomena connected with this marvelous phial which are more astonishing than the liquefaction itself, and other particulars which increase to thoughtful people the intensely interesting character of this "wonder" of St. Januarius. Before passing to their narration a word about an adjunct to the exposition which receives an unfriendly attention out of all proportion to its importance.

THE WOMEN—PRAYING OR CURSING?

The following is representative of one set of critics: "C'était quelque chose de hideux que ces vingt ou trente mégères arrachant leur bonnet de rage; menaçant S. Janvier du poing, invectivant leur parent de toute la force de leur poumons, hurlant les injures les plus grossières, vociférant les menaces les plus terribles, insultant le saint sur son autel, comme une populace ivre eût pu faire d'un parricide sur un échafaud."³³ This is from Dumas, of course, who sought dramatic effect at all costs. In contrast with the Gallic romancer, a Teutonic witness, Hurter, calmly assures us there was nothing disrespectful either in tones or words or gestures, and Dr. Weedall and Waterton bear the same testimony. He saw, as any large-hearted, well informed man would see, something touching in the steadfast claim and joy of these poor people to be connected in some particular way with their great patron and the protector of Naples.³⁴ Perhaps Postel explains correctly the genesis of the inaccurate view in a careless or prejudiced mind when, writing about these women, who are termed *la gente di S. Gennaro*, and who maintain, according to some, that they are descended from the old paralytic cured by the saint, or, according to others, from his relations who buried the martyr at night near the Solfatara and preserved the phials of his blood, he says: "Ce peuple si expressif dans toutes les circonstances de la vie commune, s'exalte et se surpasse ici lui-même; la singulière animation du visage, de la parole et des gestes inexplicable pour les natures froides du Nord ou pour l'insensibilité des âmes sans religion, ont donné lieu sans doute à cette fable des femmes insultant S. Janvier pour obtenir son

³³ *Op. cit.*, p. 226.

³⁴ "Geburt und Wiedergeburt," 1846, Vol. II., p. 552.

Miracle quand il tarde à exaucer leurs vœux et lui prodiguant les plus vulgaires épithètes."⁸⁵

All the writer saw and heard was this: Eight or ten women, some old, some young, assembled near the side of the sanctuary rail on the right hand, who commenced to pray long before the procession came, reciting the ordinary prayers and litanies, which they kept up continuously, every now and then raising the fallen pitch of their somewhat harsh voices. As they used the Neapolitan dialect, it is difficult for strangers to understand them, and of course they prayed with an earnestness and an animation which we seldom display and with an utter, most admirable indifference to what on-lookers might think, which we do not possess. Otherwise there was nothing remarkable about them. It can be admitted that thoughtless strangers to all Italy might be somewhat deceived, and one could easily believe that if the miracle were long delayed the women might so gesticulate and shout out their prayers as to transgress the bounds of respect observed among us, but never, it may be added, could they go the length of camp meeting scenes. As it was, these good women unconsciously formed a picturesque enough part of the scene, and heaven forbid that our stiff formality should ever paralyze any children of the Sunny South.

PRESENCE OF "HERETICS."

A word may as well be added here about some of the wild stories told of how non-Catholics were roughly driven from the chapel in earlier times, when the liquefaction was long delayed. There is this much truth in them, that under two circumstances such were sometimes requested to retire: first, when after several hours the miracle did not take place, and, secondly, when the liquefied blood became suddenly concrete. The writer knows of no such request within many years. St. Januarius thus shows himself, according to Putignano, *accerrimus religionis propugnator*, refusing communion with the enemies of the faith and in their presence sad and indignant. If, notwithstanding their presence, the blood liquefied, he has reasons ready, either God wished to attract them to the true faith or, if obstinate themselves, relating their experience to their friends, they might scatter good seed bearing in time good fruit.⁸⁶ Witnesses, indeed, both in the past and present, have submitted to the Church. If witnesses who write were less prejudiced, and to put it bluntly, more truthful, their readers might not indeed believe,

⁸⁵ "Le Miracle de Saint Janvier à Naples," Paris, 1857, p. 289. Consulted very frequently. The prayers said by priests and people are generally the Pater, Ave, Credo, Miserere, Athanasian Creed, etc.

⁸⁶ Putignano, "De Redivivo Sanguine," Nap., 1723, Vol. I., p. 2.

but the erroneous and contemptuous ideas concerning the wonder of Naples and the whole method of procedure would not be so prevalent. For his part the writer thinks the ceremonies are carried out with great decorum, solemnity and courtesy, and at no time did he see any collection of money in connection with them.

THE APPEARANCE OF THE BLOOD.

In the small phial there are visible only two or three dark stains on the inside.³⁷ They may be caused by very small pieces of sponge once saturated with the martyr's blood. That sponges, etc., were used to gather the blood and afterwards were inclosed in such bottles, and these were inserted in the fresh mortar near the head on the outside of the tombs, we know from St. Prudentius' hymn in honor of St. Vincent and from the Catacombs. Boldetti found one in 1714, broke it in removing it from the mortar and a sponge was within. Leibnitz made some trials on blood so found in St. Callixtus' Cemetery to see if any earth or any spices or balm were mixed with it, but he found no traces of any other substance.³⁸ Few writers mention any phenomenon in connection with the small phial, so it can be passed by the more readily, as the old martyrologies and breviaries generally speak of only one, and one is all that is represented in the more ancient paintings, images, etc.

As people generally speak of the phials, *i. e.*, in the plural, the liquefaction is also frequently spoken of as if it occurred in both; but we think this is not to be taken literally. It may be remarked that some authors mention one as filled with clear blood and the other with blood mixed with some dust, probably from the Solfatara, the place of execution.³⁹ This second is, in all likelihood, the large one which we observe to be a little more than half full of a dark reddish, slightly mottled solid mass of a slightly grainy appearance in texture. Pastel gives it: "du couleur brune, coagulé, dur, collé aux parois." It has been observed once or so yellow, black in upper part and ashy looking in lower. Dr. Pietro Punzo described a part which adhered to the glass as "giallo bruno e striato in rosse in varii punti."⁴⁰ In May, 1710, on the fifth day of the octave, it

³⁷ The contents of this phial are said to have been sent to Madrid centuries ago.

³⁸ Boldetti, *op. cit.*, p. 97. Christians wrapped the dead in aromatic cloths and put sweet-smelling spices in the tombs.

³⁹ John Rho, S. J., alone, perhaps, has *paleaque de qua praedixi satis conspicua*. (B)

⁴⁰ "Indagini ed Osservazioni sulla Teca di S. G.," Nap., 1890. Professor S. de Luca, a so-called rationalist, had made observations, etc., but died a believer before he could publish them. This was done by Professor Pietro Punzo, both, to judge from the book, cool, scientific men.

⁴¹ "Vita Bollandi," Mar., t. I., p. 33.

was of a somewhat ashy color, which it retained until September, but when taken out it regained its original color in a few hours. "Solutus subniger e rubeo vergens—opaque, color of roasted coffee, are also descriptions. It is all of the same density, and the color is uniform throughout, no separation of serum and crassamentum visible. In judging of the color it must be borne in mind that it is seen first through a glass made somewhat dim by many lips and much rubbing—it is rubbed before presentation to each individual to kiss—and through the crystal of the phial itself, sometimes not in the clearest light. To sum up, it is reasonable to admit that at rare times the color has changed, but as a rule it is dark red with yellowish white pin spots in it, and generally brighter looking when liquid. There are no stained glass windows in the chapel.

CONDITION WHEN EXPOSED.

Generally the blood is hard, yet not always so. John Rho, S. J., who saw it in 1628 and privately in 1643, says it was not arid, but concrete; when the ampulla was inclined it did not adhere to the sides, but the whole mass moved (B). Papebrock describes it in 1661 as "per grumos concretum ac fere instar arenae humidioris."⁴¹ From the diary of the chapel, begun in 1659, we learn that sometimes it is hard, very hard, partly liquefied or totally so. The rule is that it is hard when exposed.

USUAL CONDITIONS OF LIQUEFACTION.

It is brought into the vicinity and view of the head and held at a distance varying from about four feet to six or seven while waiting for the change. So far as the writer knows the bust containing the head is completely closed so that its gilt silver plate is always between the two, while in the recess there is in addition the dividing wall. As the priest holding the reliquary stands facing the people at the centre of the altar and sometimes turns partly around, it can happen that his arm or his person intervenes between the two, his arm, because he holds the teca by the stem and frequently places the fingers of his other hand lightly on the crucifix on top for greater security, especially when inclining the teca. He never touches the circular part of the reliquary or the glass, much less does he rub, or chafe, or shake it.⁴² As the blood has been found liquid, this presence of the head is not essential.⁴³ We read, more-

⁴² Such as have not seen, or if they have and still speak of such manipulations, are, in Hurter's words, "die schändlicksten lüger." *Op. cit.*, p. 552.

⁴³ Mabillon and Middleton must be classed together here. One in his "Letter from Rome" (ed. 1742, p. 208), and the other in his "Museum Italicum" (t. I., p. 105), speaks of the liquefaction in such a way as to show they either have not seen it or confound it with some other liquefaction.

over, that the Church of St. John the Baptist, commonly called San Giovanna Maggiore, had a relic of our saint—a part of a bone—and once an altar was erected outside the church and the relic placed thereon so that when the procession passed the blood was in view, whereupon it immediately liquefied. As this anticipation caused discontent, the exposure of the relic was forbidden. When Charles, Duke of Nevers, afterwards of Mantua, took the teca in his hands the liquefaction occurred, though the Archbishop had refused to allow the head to be exposed. The blood has been known to harden suddenly under the kiss of some persons.

TIME REQUIRED.

No definite time is required. It occurs in from one minute to several hours. In May, 1835, there was no liquefaction. In the two years, 1527 and 1528, there was none whatever, and in 1678 two days passed before it occurred, while in 1556 it remained liquid. Hence the absurdity of hostile or careless writers declaring "the miracle happened sooner than expected," "before the time," "at the hour appointed," etc.

THE BEGINNING OF THE LIQUEFACTION.

It is important to note that the liquefaction does not begin at any point and then gradually spread. It starts all round, and generally is instantaneous throughout. Dr. Pietro Punzo compares the beginning as he saw it to the manner in which solid paraffin would melt if immersed in something warm. It has been observed with only the middle portion liquid, and at least once (December 16, 1702) only a drop or two, which ran over the hard surface of the remainder. These are rare phases. When liquefied it may have the consistency of honey or may be as fluid as ether.

AN ACCOMPANIMENT TO THE LIQUEFACTION.

At the time of liquefaction bubbles are generally, not always, observed on the surface and through the mass, and sometimes it has, as it were, a very slight spongy appearance. Bubbles the size of a pea, declares Punzo, now few, now many, and united like foam. The writer noticed this foamy phenomenon on the surface and perhaps through the body. Baronius speaks of the ebullition. "Ebullit," writes Putignano, and adds, "saepe bullae quaedam in superficie ebullitionem praeveniunt." *Il Mattino*, of Naples, for September 21, 1904, reports: "Il sangue prezioso del Santo Patrono si liquefece ribollendo nelle ampolle senza praesentare nessun globulo, nessun grumo." Postel gives this description: "Tout à

coup à un instant ou à l'autre le sang se met à bouilloner. Vous l'aviez vu il n'y a que peu de secondes, sec, reserré, dur, et coagulé : le voici qui s'agite doucement, se liquéfie, étend son volume, bouillonne et remplit entièrement les ampoules." These last words bring to mind :

INCREASE AND DECREASE.

A most peculiar phenomenon is connected with this strange phial of blood. When it liquefies it increases in volume! It is not simply a passing increase due to the ebullition, if the latter occurs, but an increase which remains while liquid and when it re-coagulates, because when brought out liquid or solid next morning the increase is still there. At the next liquefaction it increases a little more, and so on until at the end of the week, and sometimes sooner, the phial is filled, and so filled at times that the liquefaction can only be ascertained by the closest observation. This increase takes place generally during the May exposition. In September it commences to decrease bit by bit until by the end of the week the phial is once more about half full. In this augmentation of volume, as in all the other phenomena, no absolute regularity can be expected. On May 11, 1902, there was a sudden reduction, and in September, 1870, on the first day, the usual reduction was observed, and then began an increase which remained the rest of the week. Sometimes on the same day both increase and decrease have been observed, and sometimes the phial remained full for several days. In September, 1879, taken out with the same volume as when put away in May, *i. e.*, completely filled, it liquefied in a few moments and resumed its original volume, and during the octave, though liquefying, no augmentation was observed. No mention occurs of any diminution below the normal half-filled condition of the phial.

THE GLOBO.

When the liquefaction takes place there remains very often in the centre of the liquid a portion undissolved which is commonly called the *Globo*, and which resembles a round nut, and as far as the writer remembers it did not follow in shape the configuration of the lower part of the ampulla, *i. e.*, the liquefaction did not extend from the circumference inwards in precisely equal distances all round from the crystal. This globo manifests the same variety as the other phenomena.

Sometimes it is present, sometimes not; now large, now small. It may remain the whole day, and sometimes when the teca is

exposed next morning the parts liquefied and solid are the same. The irregularities of this globo increase the difficulty of any explanation. It may be remarked that perhaps only one writer, Dr. Punzo, asserts that once he observed a portion of the liquid substance adhering to the side of the phial at its reposition in the evening, though in the morning it had not done so. The writer noticed the absence of any adhesion, and nearly all authors, he thinks, make special mention of its absence.

OPPORTUNITY OF OBSERVATION.

"Mais cette ceremonie se fait avec tant de précautions et on tient le peuple si écarté qu'à peine peut-on rien voir!"⁴⁴ so cries one in your left ear, while in your right you hear "J'étais a côté même du prêtre, qui tenait le reliquaire."⁴⁵ Strangers, if in time, can get good positions. Hurter was astonished at the freedom permitted indiscriminately to the crowd. The writer, like Dr. Weedall, was close to the Cardinal in the Church of St. Clare, and in the chapel he watched the opening of the two doors, looked in the recesses and stood close to the Monsignore who held the reliquary and the representative of the city, the Duke of Bagnoli, both of whom were very courteous and gave every reasonable opportunity to observe and to question. Many strangers, both Protestant and Catholic, were present and approached as freely as Neapolitans. When some foreign ladies did not draw near to the sanctuary rail, yet showed by their manner their desire to see, the chaplains very often and very kindly held the teca up higher and forward to afford a better view.⁴⁶ Scientific men have been granted every opportunity, short of opening the case, to handle and to examine it, as we shall presently see. "There is no attempt whatever to conceal or make a mystery of the proceeding. Quite the contrary."⁴⁷ Once it was customary to carry the head and blood to the various *sedilia* of the city,⁴⁸ and even into the houses of the great when sick. Nothing could be simpler and more above board than the whole proceeding. The frankness displayed, the utter absence of any reserve make upon all intelligent visitors a deep and lasting impression.

⁴⁴ Malte Brun, "Voy. en France en Italie," etc., t. III., let. 92, Apud Postel, 295.

⁴⁵ Lalande, "Voy. d'un Français en Italie," 1768, Vol. VII.

⁴⁶ ". . . de grandes Anglaises blondes s'avançaient jusque sur l'autel et se penchaient curieusement afin d'examiner avec leur lorgnons."—Valéry, "Voy. hist. et litter.," t. III., p. 322.

⁴⁷ Sir George Grove's description, 1869, in Murray's "Handbook for Southern Italy," ed. 1890.

⁴⁸ *Sedilla* or *Seggie*, the five political divisions of Naples, called Capuan, Porta Nuova, etc., from places near where the citizens met. Exposition was often in the open air.

EXPLANATIONS.

If the liquefaction be such a miserable trick, it is truly odd how long a time passes before a satisfactory exposure or even a good imitation can be made. The miracle is repeated eighteen times a year, *i. e.*, nine in May, eight in September and once on December 16. Thousands of strangers have seen it, hundreds of books and pamphlets and letters have been written about it. Several imitations have been made, successfully 'tis said, and again and again have men come forward to show how it is done, and men of science have made many experiments, but the imitations die aborning, the explanations fall short, the experiments fail, and at the dawn of the twentieth century, in the rich and cultured old city of Parthenope, that *fragmentum de coelo delapsum*, in Mabillon's words, where reign, said Maro, *ver perpetuum et alienis mensis aetas*, this matter *lapidescens potius quam coagulata*, said to be the blood of a martyr of the dawn of the fourth century, liquefies and manifests life when brought in sight of the head of the heroic Bishop in whose veins it once coursed, as if, says Baronius, it rejoiced to approach the martyr crowned head and recognizing the font whence it flowed and impatient of the resurrection's delay, would fain hasten to reanimate it once more.

Peter Molinaeus, a Calvinist, believed that some water and lime were introduced into the reliquary, and when mixed heat enough was developed to liquefy the blood. How were they introduced when so public? In the spirit of the Magdeburg Centuriators, Peter replies: "By the aid of the devil." Why, then, sometimes no liquefaction? Because sometimes the devil cannot work miracles on account of the presence of pious people; and if we ask how could pious people be in such a city as Naples? Peter would modestly answer that he himself or others of his persuasion might be present.⁴⁹ There is an additional touch of comedy in this reasoning when we recall that the presence of such heretics as Peter and his friends has often been regarded by the Neapolitans as the reason why the saint refused to work his miracle!

Sympathy between the blood and the head was suggested as a cause, but if so, why not always liquid? Sympathy on the part of the people has been vaguely hinted at. An atmosphere of belief may have some influence in obtaining a miracle, judging from the Gospels, not in working one; but in Naples the people are always sympathetic. Even antipathy had advocates, *i. e.*, the blood was the blood of St. Januarius, but the head was the head of his wicked judge, Timotheus, and the fable of a corpse bleeding when the murderer approached is recalled!

⁴⁹ "Vates," Lib. v. c. 14.

James Serces, vicar of Appleby, in Lincolnshire, remarked that the exhalations from Vesuvius and the Solfatara had something to do with it; but there are other heads and other bloods unaffected, and there are many dead in Naples and even close to Vesuvius.⁵⁰

Animal magnetism had a trial. How vitally active might it not be from dry skull to dry blood through silver, glass and all, and a German writer had the happy thought that there were two reliquaries, one with hard and the other with liquid blood. Add a little dexterity on the part of the manipulator and the miracle was wrought. Even one of the canons told him so; if so, who would not forgive and sympathize with the poor canon?⁵¹ A Prussian Councillor of State, Rehfuës, thought a little ice (something like "sorbets," proposed an Englishman) was all that was required, which every one knows, he graciously remarks, they can prepare better at Naples than at Archangel. "Tableau (!) de Naples" is the title of his book. After dinner one day Caspar Neumann showed to some friends a head and three phials. He presented the first phial to the head, and the liquid within boiled and increased and filled the phial; the second presented only boiled; the third remained inert, and this experiment, made once in Berlin about 1734, was widely hailed as an imitation and an exposure of the great miracle at Naples.⁵² This was the same learned man who, according to Hübner, claimed only a little air was required to produce the liquefaction, which the same Hübner styled the "secret of the monks."⁵³

Lalande says that the Prince of San Severo had a teca made similar to that of St. Januarius, filled with an amalgam of gold and mercury, with cinnibar to color it. There was a hidden reservoir of mercury and a little opening which, when the teca was turned, permitted a little more mercury to enter; then the amalgam began to move, and so the liquefaction was imitated.⁵⁴ The government forbade the working of this miracle, we are informed, and of course, being an Italian Prince, he was probably too poor to go elsewhere and too haughty to dispose of it! La Condamine made a report to the Academie des Sciences in 1757, printed in its "Memoires" in 1762, wherein he describes a very ingenious machine containing two cones of some material unknown to him, amalgam of mercury,

⁵⁰ "Traite sur les Miracles," 1729, Amsterdam.

⁵¹ Büsching, author of a geography.

⁵² "Bibliotheca Germanica," lit. 29, an. 1734. In the British Museum is a leaflet entitled "Relation du Miracle de la Liquefaction du Sang a limitation du celui Qui se pratique à Naples au sang pretendu de St. Janvier," Conigsberg, 1734.

⁵³ Hübner, "Geographie Universalle," 1757, Vol. VI., p. 495.

⁵⁴ *Op. off.*

lead and bismuth. The exhibitor promised La Condamine in Naples an exact description with a plan of all the parts. The promise was subsequently renewed, but never kept. Very probably it was the same contrivance as San Severo's. Anyhow we hear no more of it. For sake of La Condamine's own head we may mention as slight excuse that he never saw the liquefaction itself.

LATER EXPLANATIONS.

When all the various phenomena and their antiquity are borne in mind, it seems a waste of time to give the following formulas for the imitation of the Neapolitan wonder, yet they are instructive: Dissolve at moderate heat ten grains of white sago and add milk tinged with carmine; add also twelve grains of ether and place the mixture in a crystal bottle tightly corked. The mixture when cold has some consistency, but the heat of the hand or a candle suffices to melt it. This was given triumphantly by *Il Siècle* in 1858 and reprinted in many papers, including the *Times*. Dr. Punzo, by way of experiment, after many trials, made a preparation less unsatisfactory than the others, composed of alcoholic tincture of chelidonia saturated with castile soap, to which was added a slight amount of ammonia. This melted by the heat of the hand. In 1890 Professor Albini, before the Royal Academy of Physical and Mathematical Science of Naples, claimed he had a mixture of fine powdered chocolate, sugared water, cheese, whey and salt, which when allowed to remain stationary would partly solidify, and after some shakings the mass would begin to move. Sometimes it would leave no trace on the part of the glass it had passed over, and sometimes it would, and these traces when thick gave an appearance of fulness, etc. It is scarcely necessary to add that the professor, though a man of high standing as a scientist, forgot to view the liquefaction itself and to note its peculiarities. Other trials were made with gelatine, butter, etc. All these fail even to liquefy under the proper conditions. Professor Albini's mixture was not intended to be heated, simply shaken. He excluded heat as the cause. In a single bottle the heat of a candle always melted at first only the side of the mixtures; placed within a second glass they required intense heat. Glass is a bad conductor of heat. The glass of the teca is plain, has no magnifying or concentrating power; the air between the phials and their cover is still worse, so heat coming from kissing the external glass is practically nil, especially since it takes place after the liquefaction, very few doing so beforehand. What heat could a lighted candle exert, only at intervals and for a moment held behind the reliquary at a distance of three or four

inches? The other *candles* are not many in number and are four or five feet off. Cardinal Caracciolo once extinguished them all.

SECRET HEAT.

May there not be in the metal part of the reliquary some hidden tube or tubes by which, for instance, water and sulphuric acid or hot water or hot air might be secretly introduced? If so, they cannot be detected by any ordinary examination or even by the close scrutiny of doubters and scientists. Let us suppose they are present and chemicals can enter. The heat or the liquefaction would manifest itself at one point, the metal would show an increase of temperature; but to the touch the latter is not perceptible nor to the eye is the former. Could those chemicals enter unperceived?

It is very doubtful. If they did, how long would the heat generated last? How long would the liquefaction endure? Would not it liquefy from the surface downwards? Would it be uniform? Could any quantity be introduced without augmenting the volume of the contents, and if not, how account for the diminution also observed after liquefaction? And if the chemicals introduced cause a reduction, how account for the increase? And if it is lawful to think that chemicals can be so arranged as to produce those strange effects, how account for such wonderful knowledge of chemistry centuries and centuries ago? Are we to invent a miracle to avoid one? As the distinguished Fergola is said to have exclaimed in substance: "How marvelous the chemistry of the canons of the Treasury of Saint Januarius! The miracle is taken away from a dead saint to attribute it to living men!"

OBSERVATIONS ON THE TEMPERATURE.

The question of temperature, though, appeals so forcibly to many and the desire to know precisely what tale the thermometer tells is so reasonable that it may be useful to consider it at greater length.

Normal blood begins to coagulate in a few minutes after leaving the human body and is completely coagulated in from one to two or three hours, *i. e.*, the pale straw colored serum is separated from the netted jelly-like crassamentum formed of fibrin—a meshwork of fine fibrils and corpuscles. After some hours, from twelve to fifteen, this crassamentum or placenta sanguinis has contracted still more and becomes quite hard. Coagulation is hastened by heat, above 100 degrees F. producing it rapidly. It may be retarded by motion or even hindered altogether by the addition of alkalis, ammonia, concentrated solutions of salts and especially sulphate of

magnesia. Blood once coagulated cannot be rendered fluid, and blood chemically preserved fluid cannot coagulate. Heat applied to coagulated blood dries and hardens it more completely.⁵⁵ The blood in the phial when hard shows no separation of serum. It appears as said, dry, hard, clotted, etc. If we suppose that the serum was withdrawn by design, accident or evaporation, the liquefaction becomes still stranger. Assuming the liquefaction to be a purely natural, though unknown process, and the substance in the ampulla to be a mixture of some kind, let us see if it will even then obey the known laws of physics.⁵⁶

Dr. Sperindeo took the temperature both of the chapel when empty of people, with all candles extinguished, and of the reliquary by inserting the tested thermometer in the crown for support and placing the bulb against the metal part of the broad ring of silver holding the two glass sides, while the substance was quite liquid and had been so for five hours, ample time to communicate some of its heat to the case if it had any extra, and he found the two temperatures alike. The first time he took it there were several persons grouped around the teca, and he found a difference of over two degrees, which he attributed to their presence, so he returned on the next day and used the above precautions. Consequently the fusion is not due apparently to heat in the reliquary, neither is it due to the difference of temperature between the chapel and the niche, because when the reliquary was reposed at night he placed a good maximum and minimum thermometer in the niche itself, and next morning 16 degrees, 8 C. was found registered. When put in the temperature was 17 degrees, 1 C., only a difference of 0 degrees, 3 C.⁵⁷ The niche, from its structure, position and freedom from currents of air, is very dry. Neither was the temperature of the chapel taken in May, 1890, notably different from the average temperature of the city, as was determined by comparing the degrees marked for a few days with those given in the Meteorological Bulletins of the Royal University of Naples. Take into account that

⁵⁵ At Benedict XIV's request, Professor Fortunio Liceto applied heat to the blood of a lamb, etc., with serum separated and not separated, and even to the blood taken from the heart of a Jesuit. This last qualification may have interfered with the success of the experiment, even though the Jesuit was dead. "De Can. Sanct.," lib. 4, c. 31, a II.

⁵⁶ The following six paragraphs are condensed entirely from Dr. Sperindeo's "Il Miracolo di San Gennaro," third edit., Naples, 1903. Those who wish to read his arguments and experiments in full are recommended to consult his pamphlets. They are apparently accurate and trustworthy. In the historical part he is perhaps not so critical or careful.

⁵⁷ Bonito, in "Gli ultimi progressi delle scienze sperimentale e la Liquefazione del Sangue di S. G.," Milan, 1881, remarks that other bodies and phials of blood have been brought up from the cold catacombs to the bright sunshine, yet no liquefaction was observed.

on 19th of September, 1879, the thermometer showing 30 degrees C. or 86 degrees F. in the chapel, over two hours passed before liquefaction set in, and on 25th of September the same year, the thermometer being 25 degrees C. or 77 degrees F., the time was thirteen minutes. Fergola published tables of observations taken in September, 1794, and we learn from them that four days the temperature was 80 degrees F., and the time from five to twenty-seven minutes, and in May, 1795, the temperature was 76 degrees on three days and the time from two to twenty-eight minutes, and twice at 77 degrees the time was twenty-nine and forty-one minutes.⁵⁸ Every known substance and every mixture fuses at a certain fixed temperature; the phial knows no such rule.

FUSION AND PRESSURE.

Every substance, as just said, melts at a certain temperature. If subjected to pressure, the melting point will be higher. Now it is well known that considerable pressure is required to raise the melting point one degree; anywhere from 28 to 500 atmospheres to raise it from one to ten degrees for such substances as paraffin, sulphur, stearine, wax, etc. It can be seen at a glance that no such pressure could be exerted in an antique crystal phial, leaving aside all the other improbabilities and impossibilities involved under the circumstances in such a hypothesis. Neither can we assume that as the phial fills the pressure changes and the time required perhaps may correspond in some measure to this change, for the irregularity in the tables shows exclusively that no such correspondence exists. In these considerations it would still be a question of heat, and that, we may safely conclude, is now ruled out of the question. Diminution of pressure can claim no consideration.

VARIABILITY OF VOLUME.

Most bodies expand when heated; some contract; others, very few, within certain limits, expand and contract, like iodide of silver, which from -10 degrees C. to $+70$ degrees C. contracts when heated and expands when cooled, as demonstrated by Fizeau, and every body under a certain pressure has a determined volume corresponding to its temperature. This increase or decrease, it need scarcely be said, in the case of solids and liquids is very minute; gases we need not consider here. The contents of the ampulla pay no attention to these laws. It expands, contracts or remains in-

⁵⁸ "Teorica de Miracole esposta" and "Un Discorso Apologetico sul Miracolo di S. G.," Naples, 1839. One of the deepest thinkers and distinguished scholars of Europe, in Hurter's judgment.

variable under the same atmospheric pressure and at the same temperature! Dr. Sperindeo gives a table of thirteen solids, such as graphite, carbon, sulphur, arsenic, quartz, iodide of silver, etc., and a second table of ten liquids, such as sulphuric acid, alcohol, ether, etc., and by Fizeau's formula shows their corresponding coefficients of expansion. Since the temperature at which the liquefaction and solidification of the discussed substance takes place varies as a rule from 16 degrees C. to 27 degrees C., it is not necessary to go outside this range. The expansion may occur before or after or during the liquefaction. Taking, then, quartz and wood alcohol, which show the greatest expansion, and multiplying by the coefficients of expansion for every degree from 16 degrees C. to 27 degrees C. and adding the products together, the following are the results, assuming the contents of the phial to be when half full $\text{cm}^3 30$: Quartz: $\text{cm}^3 30 \times 0.000125599 = \text{cm}^3 0.003766777$. Wood alcohol: $\text{cm}^3 30 \times 0.013900219 = \text{cm}^3 0.41700657$.

Thus, if expansion occurs before liquefaction by the effect of heat, the greatest expansion would be $\text{cm}^3 0.00376$, etc.; if after liquefaction, the greatest expansion would be $\text{cm}^3 0.417006$, etc., and this last, the greater expansion of the two, will not be surpassed if the expansion is partly before and partly after liquefaction. Taking the longer diameter of the phial to be cm^3 and the shorter as cm^3 , the level of the liquid would be raised either 0.000251118 or 0.027800439; but in the phial there is an increase of nearly 30cm^3 , as it completely fills at times the empty half of the phial, the volume of which is about 60cm^3 , or two liquid ounces. Hence results an expansion at least 71 times greater than the ordinary maximum of the substances chosen for comparison within the selected degrees of temperature! No such augmentation seems to be known in physics. It cannot be claimed that the expansion of the first day is to be taken into account when seeking the expansion on the second day, and so on, because a body at a given temperature should have a definite volume, and when the temperature remains the same or rises or falls the volume should follow suit, but leaving aside this fact, the expansion of the selected substances at the end of nine days, under even this unreasonable supposition, would be for the solid, $0.003766777 \times 9 = 0.033900999$; liquid, $0.417006573 \times 9 = 3.753059339$, leaving still the increase in the phial about eight times greater. If some one demand that allowance for the increase of the daily increase be made, it would only bring the above products up to about 0.033914, etc., for the solid and 3.996858, etc., for the liquid, which would not affect the result to any appreciable extent. And these calculations are made on the supposition that the augmentation of volume is regular, whereas it is very fluctuating, as pointed

out, sometimes filling in one day and again diminishing when an increase might be expected.

THE INCREASE AND THE SCALE.

A very radical and very vulgar anti-clerical paper published in Rome, self styled the *Asino*, objected to the statement that there was any real augmentation of matter. Such a thing would be a paradox, an impossibility, and all that was required to prove this was that Dr. Sperindeo should weigh the reliquary before and after the phenomenon. A suggestion so reasonable very seldom appears in its columns. Well, Dr. Sperindeo declares he weighed the teca most carefully and repeatedly by three different methods, and got the following result :

The teca with phial almost full.....	Kg. 1.01490
The teca with phial half full.....	0.98791 ⁵⁰
	<hr/> 0.02699

This difference of about 27 grams corresponds perfectly to an approximate diminution of volume of 23 to 24 cubic centimeters !

DIFFICULTIES OF THE GLOBO.

The *globo* presents some difficulties. It is of the same density as the rest of the matter, as is evident from the position it occupies and that when melted there is no part of the liquid denser than another. Consequently it should have the same melting point, but sometimes it has remained solid for twenty-four hours, as in May, 1902, while the remainder was perfectly liquid. It varies in size and is often found wanting. Heat producing liquefaction could not, especially after some hours, but reach the *globo*, and it is to be borne in mind that there has been observed no correspondence between the time elapsing before liquefaction or the temperature of the air or the greater or less fluidity of the substance and the size, continuance, presence or absence of the *globo*.

THE PHIAL AND THE SPECTROSCOPE.

Until comparatively lately no doubt was raised as to the contents of the ampulla being blood mixed maybe with a few grains of dust. If we take the words of Robert Gaguin literally, the phial was open in the time of Charles VIII. of France, who was handed a little rod of silver to test the hardness of the blood, and he found it "hard

⁵⁰ Page 63 of Sperindeo's work gives 0.98701 by a misprint for 0.98791, as found in Professor Januario's "Il Sangue di S. G. Nap.," 1902, p. 30.

as a stone." The Bollandists suggest that this is to be taken as merely meaning he took the teca in his hand by means of the silver stem. If we take Gaguin's version as correct, it will be rather difficult to harmonize it with the belief that the reliquary itself dates back to the time of King Robert; and yet, on the other hand, no notice is found ascribing the inclosure of the phial in the teca to any other date. We can take for granted that it was certainly so inclosed before 1659, when the Diary begins, and very probably some centuries earlier, since in the Diary and earlier accounts no mention occurs of such a work. However that may be, all old-time observers, whether they could see it better than we can or not, were unanimous as to its being genuine blood.⁶⁰ The constituents of the distant stars can be determined without analysis, why not the nature of this substance? Apply the spectroscope. The spectrum of arterial blood, or oxyhæmoglobin, is in general characterized by the presence of two absorption bands between the D and E lines of the solar spectrum. The first band commences at the D line and extends towards E. The second commences after a short gap and terminates at the E line.⁶¹ Having mounted a drop of his own blood to get spectrum for sake of comparison to avoid error, Dr. Sperindeo, with a specially prepared spectroscope and a light whose wick had been saturated with chloride of sodium, tilted the teca until he managed to get a good spectrum of the substance, as a thin layer of it was spread over the inclined side of the phial, and thus along with Professor Januario, of the Royal University, observing both spectra, *i. e.*, of his own blood and of the phial, he found, in his own words: "Si vide allora immediamenti comparire nello spectro dopo la linea D la banda oscura caratteristica del sanguine, seguita dall'altra nell verde e tra le due una zona chiara;" in other words, he had found the spectroscope of arterial blood. Professor Januario exclaimed: "I would like to photograph everything exactly!" The stains in the little phial gave the same lines. It would seem, then, reasonable to conclude that the phial of St. Januarius contains blood. If this spectrum is correct, the fact that it is the spectrum of arterial and not of venous blood renders the whole thing more wonderful, as from the color of the blood when hard and its long captivity in the ampulla it could be reasonably expected that its oxygen would be nearly if not quite vanished. Maybe its temperature when liquid is that of flowing blood.

⁶⁰ "The blood had liquefied so naturally, as to the color and consistency that no blood from a vein could appear more lively."—Lord Perth's letters, under date February 1, 1696, quoted in Murray's "Handbook for Southern Italy," ed. 1890.

⁶¹ Landolt's "Human Physiology," ed. by Starling, 1904, pp. 25, etc. Mann's "Forensic Medicine," 1902, pp. 73, 74.

BELIEF IN THE MIRACLE.

As Dumas was placed among the doubters, let him appear among the believers. He was perhaps no more sincere in one than in the other, yet his credo is openly recited, while the nego is only, perhaps, unconsciously implied in the story. Contradiction in his writings, visible or latent, caused him no worry. This quotation is from the same work containing the story:⁶²

"Maintenant que le doute lève sa tête pour nier, que la science élève sa voix pour contredire : voilà ce qui est, voilà ce qui fait sans mystère, sans supercherie, sans substitution à la vue de tous. La philosophie du dix—huitième siècle et la chimie moderne y ont perdu leur latin : Voltaire et Lavoisier ont voulu mordre à cette fiole, et, comme le serpent de la fable, ils-y-ont usé leur dents—Maintenant, est-ce un secret gardé par les chanoines du Trésor et conservé de génération en génération depuis le quatrième siècle jusqu' à nous ? Cela est possible ; mais alors cette fidélité, on en conviendra, est plus miraculeuse encore que le Miracle. J'aime donc mieux croire tout bonnement au Miracle, et pour ma part je déclare que j'y crois."

Many repeat after Voltaire that the well instructed Neapolitans and Italians in general regard this miracle as Horace did the melting incense of Gnatia, only they do not permit themselves to speak so frankly as he did, their conduct and language about any subject connected with even the most popular belief being governed by the danger of being thought unbelievers and the little inconvenience they experience by appearing too credulous. We doubt if this was ever true of any large number, and certainly it is not to-day, though the danger mentioned is a thing of the past. Novelty and

⁶² This story by Dumas, mentioned in the opening paragraph, scarcely deserves or needs any further refutation. One reason why it is not true reminds us of the anecdote told of a Mayor of a little German village honored and flustered by an unexpected visit from the Emperor, upon whom he waited, trembling to explain why no cannon had been fired as a salute. "Your Imperial Majesty, there are fifty reasons. First, we have no cannon; secondly, we have no powder—" "That will do," said the Emperor, smiling. "The first is sufficient." Champlonnet was not in Naples in May, 1799! He visited the chapel privately in January of that year, and died several months later at Antibes. Cardinal Zurlo, then Archbishop, was friendly not hostile to the French. He signed a pastoral, "Le Citoyen Joseph Marie Card. Archevêque de Naples" (Analecta Boll., Vol. XIX., p. 49), and even caused it to be known that St. Januarius, by an unusual liquefaction, declared for the French. The same story was told of General Alvarey by M. Duclos ("Lettres sur l'Italie," 1778) as happening about fifty years earlier, and a M. N. de La Cecilia has another one fifty years later, May 6, 1848. L'Abbé Postel, who was there the same day, exposed his falsehoods. Finally, if the story were true, it would prove nothing against the genuineness of the miracle.

wonder go hand in hand and frequency weakens admiration. Many of them probably never ask themselves seriously whether they believe in it as a miracle or not, but the Rev. John Chetwode Eustace, who regretted his flippancy and intended to change his words when death prevented him, wrote incorrectly, asserting that the Neapolitans had adapted the rule of the ancient Germans as given by Tacitus: "Sanctius et reverentius est de diis credere quam scire."⁶⁸ To consider the liquefaction as a trick would be impossible except to a few noted for their atheistic or irreligious views. As many Londoners have never visited the Tower, so some Neapolitans may have never seen the miracle. The opportunity being at hand, they procrastinate like other mortals. As a people they do believe and are attached to it, though both belief and attachment may appear somnolent or non-existent until something arises to disturb their calm indifference. Many an object until threatened evokes little display of the deep feelings it can arouse. Towards the middle of the eighteenth century Bishop Sabbatinus wrote that some Catholics who had never seen it doubted it, but once seen doubt vanished. It is much the same to-day. Some outside Italy have never heard, or have forgotten, or give themselves no concern about it. If they were suddenly asked their opinion they would be puzzled to reply. The liquefaction, like other miracles recorded of the saints, is for them a question of proof. Its long continuance and the attitude of the Church in Italy while inclining the will to believe, could not of itself be sufficient to move the intellect to assent. The Church has given no decision, and no circumstances seem likely to arise to urge her to do so. Some doubt, but once examined the great majority would believe, and not one in ten thousand after seeing it would hesitate to accept it as supernatural, and that one at most would be worried with the thought that perhaps after all it might be explained on purely natural grounds. Horace was referred to on account of the lines in the fifth satire of the first book descriptive of his journey to Brundisium:

Dehinc Gnatia, lymphis
Iratæ exstructa dedit risusque, jocosque
Dum flamma sine thura liquescere limine sacro
Persuadere cupit.

It is said that the raillery of Horace extinguished for good the fireless smoking incense. Did Voltaire hope by his satiric grin to congeal forever the blood of St. Januarius? The next paragraph may answer.

PROPHECIES.

Prophecies are not rated very high at present, but to render the

⁶⁸ Author of the charming "Tour Through Italy," London, 1813, p. 492.

account less incomplete, a few words about foretelling by the blood and about the blood. Is it a prophetic blood? The writer paid but little attention to this question, and merely wishes to record the present popular opinion, which is that when the blood is found liquid it is generally regarded as a bad sign. If found hard, and it remains so, the omen for evil is emphatic. Girolamo M. di Sta. Anna, in his life of the saint (1733), says the finding it liquid is a sign of some danger happily averted, and Tutini considered it a sign of future grace. Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini (Pius II.) mentions in 1456 its prophetic aspect, and Robert Gaguin adds that the liquefaction was supposed to indicate a new ruler's right, and *vice versa*. Hence the stories told about the supposed compulsory liquefaction. There has been observed some correspondence between the failure of the miracle and hurtful events, but whether they were more than coincidences is an open question.

How few men can resist the inclination or inspiration to prophesy! Even the High Priest of pseudo-rationalism fell a victim and burst forth A. D. 1764 in quite a solemn strain: "Archbishops of Naples! the time shall come when the blood of Mr. St. Januarius will not liquefy when it approaches his head. It shall be when the Neapolitans know enough to know that this sleight of hand is not worth a ducat to them and is absolutely useless to the prosperity of the citizens." The note of utility is heard again. And how long a time must elapse before the nobles and citizens attain this giddy height of knowledge, O prophet? With a vagueness surpassing Biblical prophetic vagueness, so exasperating to some critics, comes the reply: "Some centuries" (*dans quelques siècles*). Knowledge surely lingers. Twenty-five years after M. Dupaty, another "romancier voyageur," being a man of desires, wrote that for some time the miracle had fallen into disrepute and it was likely to cease soon. A century has passed since the disciple wrote, and with the advance of knowledge the mystery of Naples deepens, and a later science than Lavoisier's only reveals depths still greater and difficulties more numerous than superficial inquiry had discovered and discussed.

CONCLUSION.

A miracle? The writer fosters no hope that *à priori* disbelievers or theorists who hold miracles ceased at the close of the apostolic age or of the first few Christian centuries will believe the liquefaction to be miraculous. Neither will he discuss the questions very likely to arise as to this miracle's utility, probability or consistency with Divine Wisdom. Admit one miracle since creation, and logically all others can enter in if fortified with sufficient proof. A

miracle because of its supernatural origin is regarded with suspicion or as a natural fact misunderstood or unexplained. Sciences like astronomy and chemistry know facts which run contrary to accepted theories, but though troublesome they are tolerated and progress is made. A miracle comes clothed in such circumstances as to show plainly it is an *ex lex*, and as such it could be confined in a special category; but this consideration soothes not the nerves of those who affect to dread, like Professor Huxley, that if its possibility were granted a miracle might force its unbidden and unheralded way like a bold poor relation into the halls of science or, to change the expression, it might spring up unexpectedly out of the crucible like a jack-in-the-box. No. The laws of nature must be maintained inviolate despite Omnipotence and the will of the Lawgiver; so the reader, if he will, may finish the quotation from Horace:

Credat Judaeus Apella,
Non ego.

And if, though a believer in miracles, you hesitate at this one, you can fall back upon the fact the matter has not been analyzed; other substances give almost identical spectrums with oxyhæmoglobin; the dust of the Solfatara mixed with the blood may produce strange results, etc. In a word, you can summon up many doubts from the vast sea of possibility by calling on unknown forces, unknown rays, unknown substances; but it is not asking too much of a careful reader to think that Professor Punzo may have been right when, after his examinations, he concluded: "Since the liquefaction and all the other phases presented by the substance in question can be explained by no means known to us, we must conclude that in the present state of science we cannot solve this mysterious problem."

If some one be so extremely credulous (a mild word here) as to think it a trick or fraud, to believe that the venerable Archbishop of Naples and the grave and reverend canons and chaplains dare, through simplicity, in the twentieth century, in broad daylight, to have solemn processions and to invite the whole world, as we may say, to be present at the melting by a little heat of a little gelatine, or sago, or some "mixture fusing at a low temperature,"⁶⁴ and then dare, through wickedness, to sing hymns of praise to God, or rather

⁶⁴ Few men have apparently consulted so many books as Andrew D. White, LL. D., L. H. D. It is to be hoped that the following extract is not a fair sample of his historical research and critical ability. The ex-president of Cornell University saw the miracle in 1856, and yet he wrote: "To the scientific mind this miracle is very simple. The vials contain, *no doubt*, one of those mixtures fusing at low temperature, which when kept in its place within the cold stone walls of the church remain solid, but upon being brought out into the hot, crowded chapel, and *fondled* by the warm hands of the priests, gradually softens and becomes liquid" (*italics not in the original*).—"New Chapters in the Warfare of Science," XII., Part I.

of insult, for He has no need of lies; if some one prefer to believe all this and the added miracle, no slight one, that for centuries and centuries the formula of the compound must have been kept a profound secret, all the writer would ask in this hypothesis, a hypothesis little flattering either to the head or to the heart of those in whose favor it is made, is that the trick of the liquefaction be not characterized as "bungling" or "miserable," since it has defied discovery and imitation for a thousand years, and is likely—forgive the lapse into prophecy—to continue to do so yet a little while.

If analyzed to-morrow, and thus found to be blood, would any one believe on that account? Not one. Let us suppose that the cause of such a peculiar liquefaction, at variance with all known laws of physics and chemistry, with its strange increases of volume and weight, would some day be explained by science, would even then any doubt be cast by reasonable men on the veracity and honesty of any concerned in the preservation and exhibition of the phial of St. Januarius?

E. P. GRAHAM.

Lapeer, Mich.

THE HELIAND.

GERMAN poetry and song are as old as the German people. When history first becomes acquainted with the blond-haired and blue-eyed warriors of the German forests she also learns of their soul-stirring songs. When the Germans,¹ Tacitus tells us, march to battle they sing the praises of their ancient heroes. Armenius was one of these bold warriors celebrated by his countrymen in the second century—Armenius, who had crushed the legions of Varus and the spirit of the aged Augustus. Raising their deep voices in far resounding chorus, they roused themselves and one another to fight the hereditary enemy, to emulate their hero's prowess. The earliest songs of the Germans, then, like the earliest songs of the Greeks, were choruses. Soon, however, the hearers craved to learn not only the names of the bold champions, but their deeds also. But to sing of their achievements, to describe their daring exploits, was beyond the power of the chorus. Only the single singer could be followed as he passed from phase to phase of the exciting tale. Thus arose the ballad singer and the epic bard. The German tribes when they left their wild forests to conquer the Roman world were accom-

¹ Tacitus, *Germania*, ch. III.

panied by these heralds of bravery and heroism. When at length the invasion was successful and the Theodorics and Chlodovics founded kingdoms and rested from their warlike labors, amid the remnants of Roman luxury and splendor, the German minstrel—*scôp* is his Anglo-Saxon name—was the never-failing guest of the royal table. There, when the material feast had ended, he raised his voice to sing the wonderful exploits of his host and his host's forefathers. Even at the court of that scourge of God, Attila the Hun, many of whose paladins were Germans, Priscus, the Byzantine Emperor's envoy, listened to German bards singing their ballads. At each stirring passage the young warriors ominously rattled their swords, while the gray-beards, conscious that age henceforth debarred them from the excitement and the wild joys of battle, silently wept, so did the minstrel move the hearts of these men. Most moving of all these minstrels, perhaps, was luckless Gelimer, the last King of the Vandals in Africa. When reduced to the last extremity he begged his conqueror for a lyre, and to its strains sang the sad tale of his woes and disasters.

It was at the court of the Ostrogoths that these minstrels reached the height of art and fame. Even before the great Theodoric (Dietrich) smote the Herulan Odovaker (A. D. 488) and fixed his court at Verona,² Gothic singers had embalmed the story of their nation in verse. The influence of Roman taste and culture was not lost on this gifted people, and again the conquered vanquished their conquerors. Soon the fame of the Gothic minstrels reached the farthestmost limits of Germany, and their ballads resounded at the court of the Frank and the Burgundian. Wherever the German hordes had settled, wherever the German tongue was spoken, the names of the Gothic heroes became household words. Hildebrand and Dietrich, of Bern, were as well known on the Rhine as on the Po and the Tiber. In the course of time their names became interwoven with those of the great northern heroes, Siegfried and Hagen, in utter defiance of history, chronology and geography. The Franks themselves had no national epic till 500 A. D. But soon inspired and taught by their Gothic brethren, the Frankish bards chanted the achievements of Siegfried, their national champion. In the course of the sixth century Norse skalds repeated their lays in the far North.

How many of these epics were then composed, how popular they became and what were their poetic merits we cannot now ascertain. Only a few remnants have escaped the ravages of time. The Anglo-Saxon song of Beowulf may be classed as one of these. The Anglo-Saxon language was a dialect of the Germanic language.

² Bern in the German epics.

The Latin ballad of Walther of Aquitaine, written by Ekkehard, a monk of St. Gall, as a youthful exercise in Latin verse, and pronounced by Sherer a poem full of manly vigor and poetic inspiration, presupposes a German ballad from which Ekkehard drew his story.³ But the only strictly German relic of this supposed harvest of song is the lay of Hildebrand. Even this is a mere fragment. On account of its being the earliest specimen of German narrative poetry, as well as on account of its own merits, it deserves to be briefly sketched.

Hildebrand, foremost among Dietrich's warriors, has shared his master's exile and lived for years at the court of Etzel (Attila), the Hun. At last the day of liberation arrives. At the head of an army of his Goths, aided by the Huns, Dietrich crosses the Alps to reconquer his kingdom. Chief among his warriors is Hildebrand. Hildebrand when driven from Italy had left behind him a youthful wife and infant son—Hadubrand. When Dietrich reaches Italy he is met by a hostile army. Hadubrand is one of its chiefs. "I have heard," the minstrel begins, abruptly, "that Hildebrand and Hadubrand challenged each other to battle." When father and son, armed and mounted, meet face to face, Hadubrand, in answer to his father's inquiry, proudly proclaims himself Hildebrand's son. A second question, and a more detailed answer leaves no doubt in the father's mind. His challenger is his own son. He is deeply stricken by the tragic situation. He tells Hadubrand his name. In vain. Hildebrand, the young hero tells him, has died the warrior's death. The father offers his son his bracelets, the proudest ornament of the Teuton warrior. Hadubrand scornfully rejects the offered presents. He almost begs his son to seek some other foe. Then Hadubrand taunts him with cowardice, and the aged hero knows that he has no choice. Cruel fate has decreed that he must either slay his own son or fall by the hand of the obstinate man. In pathetic but manly words he gives utterance to the bitter struggle that rends his soul. Then the combat begins. Bravely each hero meets his opponent. They hurl their spears, which glance from their shields. Instantly they leap from their steeds, draw their falchions and hack each other's wooden-rimmed shields. Here ends the fragment preserved for us on the covers of a theological tract by two monks of Fulda. But we know the result of the duel from other sources. The son falls by the father's sword, and Hildebrand's lament concluded the tragic song. It seems almost an echo of the Greek legends that tell in heart-moving words of the pitiless rule of Fate, the legends of *Œdipus* and *Orestes*.

³ The Latin poem was written about 900 A. D. A spirited German version may be found in Von Scheffel's *Ekkehard*.

The Lay of Hildebrand, then, is the only remnant of the early pre-Christian German epic.

It is truly to be regretted that so little of this early poetry remains. These early pagan minstrels were not destined long to bask in the sunshine of royalty. One after another the German tribes, and especially their chiefs, listened to Christ's teaching and forswore the worship of Donar and Wodan. As early as 500 A. D. Clovis, the Frankish conqueror, embraced the faith, and soon other chiefs followed. St. Columbanus, an Irish missionary, became the apostle of the Alemanni (600-700 A. D.), and about the same time St. Gall, another Irish monk, founded the monastery of St. Gall in Switzerland, for centuries the foster mother of learning and virtue. In the eighth century St. Boniface carried the light of the Gospel to Holland and Central Germany, and not long after Charlemagne, some times a rude missionary, it must be admitted, brought the Saxons and their bold Duke Widukind under the yoke of Christ. The spread of the faith did not prove propitious to the old German minstrel. Many of his songs celebrated the power and achievements of Wodan and the other divinities that dwelt in Asgard, the German Olympus. Even his praises of the national heroes were saturated with too much pagan lore. To Christian missionaries and converted chiefs such lays, attractive on account of their form, popular as the inheritance of their fathers, might well seem dangerous obstacles to the spread and final victory of Christianity.

In this way the introduction of Christianity was fatal to the old German court minstrels. But we must not infer that the rulers and Bishops of Christianized Germany were hostile to culture and enlightenment. No man in the history of civilization is in fairness less open to this charge than the great Charles, the Frankish conqueror of the Saxons. No monarch has done more for the intellectual and spiritual welfare of his subjects. No sovereign has been a more ardent admirer of learning, of literature and of art. We shall not here speak of all he did for the education of his court, his nobles and the clergy. We shall speak of him only as a furtherer of old German literature. Zealous promoter and protector of Christianity, he ordered his scholars to make a collection of the old national poems, objectionable though they were from the Christian standpoint. Unfortunately his scholarly care was in vain. These venerable monuments of the earliest German literature have perished, leaving hardly a trace behind them. But Charlemagne's activity in another direction was destined to bear richer fruit. By his order the Creed, the Our Father and the Gospel according to St. Matthew were translated into German for the use of the people. This is the earliest German prose of which history has preserved

mention. To us this primitive collection may seem of little worth from a literary point of view. But, when we recall the multitude of grand and sublime thoughts thus made familiar to the rude children of the primeval German forests, we, the best elements of whose civilization are after all built upon these same fundamental documents, should be the last to belittle the wisdom and the greatness of this achievement.

Soon the poetic spirit of the German people found in the new faith new material for its creative activity. Among the oldest specimens of extant German poetry are the "Wesso bounner Gebet" and the "Muspilli." The former furnishes us with a poetic account of the creation, while the theme of the latter poem is the "Last Judgment." Thus the muse passed into the service of the Christian religion. Most of the religious poems written in the period between 700 and 900 A. D. have left no traces. All the more important and interesting is the old Saxon poem called by its first publisher (1830 A. D.) "The Heliand" (or the Saviour), the oldest extant competent poetic monument of the German language.

"The Heliand" has been pronounced by Vilmar, a noted historian of German literature, "the best, most perfect and most sublime creation of Christian poetry" and "one of the grandest poems produced by the poetic inspiration of man." Surely this is no ordinary praise, and the poem that has called forth such enthusiasm in a nineteenth century scholar is well deserving our study. Before introducing our readers to "The Heliand" itself, let us glance at its history, for, as the old grammarian says: "Books, too, have their fortunes." No mediæval chronicler speaks of the old Saxon bard and his *Christiad*. In 1562 Matthius Flacius Illyricus, in a pamphlet containing a bitter attack on Catholicism, published a Latin fragment entitled "Praefatio and Versus," which informs us that the Emperor Louis the Pious, son of the Great Charles, designing to spread among the Saxons the knowledge of the Christian religion, had engaged a well-known Saxon bard to tell in Saxon verse the story of the Old and New Testaments. The "Praefatio" was often republished by subsequent scholars, but as yet no trace of the poem had been found. Not till 1705 did any part of the text of "The Heliand" appear, and then only a small fragment was printed by George Hickes, an English scholar, in his "*Linguarum Veterum Septentrionalium Thesaurus*," Oxford, 1705. Hickes found the treasure in a manuscript still preserved in the Cottonian collection of the British Museum, which Sir Robert Cotton (+1631) had owned and, as a note in his own handwriting informs us, had considered to be a Danish poem. Hickes himself at first judged the language to be Anglo-Saxon, but afterwards declared that it

was Frankish and that the text contained a poem. In 1720 Johann Georg Eckhart, who had become acquainted with our epic, ventured the opinion that the "Praefatio" published by Flacius referred to the poem found in Sir Robert Cotton's library. It is interesting to know that Klopstock, the famous author of the "Messiade," took an interest in the *Messiade* of the old Saxon bard. After Klopstock various German scholars studied and copied a second manuscript found at Bamberg and now in the Munich library. Among these were Schiller's brother-in-law, Reinwald, who made a copy of the Munich codex and composed a grammar of its language, which, however, were not published. He also recognized the work as a poem, while Docen found that it was written in alliterative verse. Reinwald also adopted Eckhart's view that the poem was the same as the one spoken of in the "Praefatio" published by Mathias Flacius. Reinwald's studies fell into the hands of J. A. Schmeller, who made them the basis of the first complete edition of the work, which appeared in 1830. Schmeller was also the author of the name "The Heliand." Schmeller's edition led to a closer study of the work by Germanistic scholars and was the forerunner of editions by Köne, Heyne, Rückert, Sievers and Behaghel and of translations by Simrock, Kannegiesser, Köne, Rapp, Grein and Herrmann. These editors and translators include some of the most distinguished names in Germanic philology and are a guarantee that the work has not only been thoroughly studied, but also that it was worthy of patient investigations.

For years the question whether "The Heliand" is or is not the work spoken of in the "Praefatio" has been discussed pro and con. The "Praefatio" has been most minutely scrutinized and analyzed, and it is now unanimously held that the title is a misnomer due to Flacius, and that it is really a letter written probably not very long after the composition of the poem, that is to say, in the ninth century. The most telling argument against identifying "The Heliand" with the Saxon lay spoken of in the "Praefatio" was the fact that while the latter speaks of a poem including both Old and New Testaments, "The Heliand" contains no part of the Old Testament story. This difficulty, however, was removed in 1894, when Zange-meister and Braune published some fragments of a Saxon metrical version of Genesis found in the "Bibliotheca Palatina" at Heidelberg. Therefore there really existed, as stated in the "Praefatio," an old Saxon metrical version of the Old Testament. At present most scholars endorse the genuineness of the "Praefatio" and the identity of "The Heliand" with the old Saxon poem there mentioned.

"The Heliand" literature deals with two other questions—the

author and his home. No clue whatsoever exists as to the author's name, which is not even mentioned in the "Praefatio." That "The Heliand" was written in old Saxon is now generally conceded; but in what part of the Saxon land it was written is by no means settled. The difficulty of deciding it is increased by the circumstance that the two principal manuscripts of "The Heliand"—the Cottonian and the Munich—exhibit marked dialectic variations, and naturally suggest different places of origin according as the critic prefers the one or the other. It is needless to pursue the subject further. We confine ourselves to the remark that Münster and Werden are the places chiefly favored by authoritative German critics, though it cannot be said that there is any approach to unanimity on the question.

On the poetic merits of our epic there is some variety of opinion. While Vilmar, in his "History of German Literature," declares enthusiastically that no epic in any language singing the story of Our Saviour is at all to be compared with "The Heliand," Scherer denies to it almost all poetic merit and looks upon it as a kind of metrical tract. Between these extremes we meet with many intermediate opinions. Among these we may quote: Simrock, who declares that what Klopstock failed to accomplish the author of "The Heliand" achieved, namely, a truly poetic Christiad; Köne, who judges "The Heliand" to be a creation worthy to be admired and to be revered; Rapp, according to whom our bard is not only a noble Christian and patriot, but a great poet; Windisch, who calls our poem a perfect epic according to the rules of art; Grein, who describes to it a charm which impresses us the more, the more we study the poem; Schultz, who finds in it an artistic perfection only to be expected in the work of a highly gifted poet; Rückert, who pronounces the author of "The Heliand" a poet of the first rank; Koegel, whose judgment is to the effect that the old Saxon *scôp* is a true artist of by no means small abilities, whilst in another passage he maintains that though perhaps the poem has been by some praised too highly, the poet has done the possible, and to expect him to turn the New Testament into an epic full of life and action is to expect the impossible; Bechstein, who calls it a remarkable and original creation; Braune, in whose opinion the work ought to be rated higher poetically than has become fashionable recently. Braune's and Koegel's views are repeated by Paul.

We could multiply quotations of a similar character, but this would only weary the reader. Nor is it worth while to set down the unfavorable opinions of Scherer and Behaghel, when we find the best German scholars, both philologists and historians, unanimous in heralding its excellence. To us the judgment of Koegel

seems to hit the mark. The author of "The Heliand" has chosen for his subject a difficult theme, but he has achieved all that can be looked for. Let us for a moment ponder the task he set himself. A long epic, for its complete success, demands connected and interesting action, possessing strict unity, with a hero impressive and sympathetic, surrounded by striking minor characters who, while providing variety of interest, are a foil to the principal hero. Now the story of the New Testament, while it offers the poet the most sublime of all heroes, has two weak features from the point of view of the epic writers—it is lacking in action and furnishes almost no secondary characters. For alongside of Christ all the other actors, both His followers and His enemies, are dwarfed. Even the Blessed Virgin, great as is the poet's devotion to her and manifest as are his efforts to throw strong lights on her, is a passive character. How he has painted St. Peter the reader will have occasion to judge while perusing the excerpts to be quoted. Herod, Pilate, Annas, Caiphas are not attractive characters to deal with, and besides their share in the action is, so to say, episodal. The lack of action in the Biblical narrative has already been suggested, and this is brought into relief by the long didactic passages recording Our Lord's teaching. Christ's miracles on the one hand add striking incidents to the progress of the story; on the other, many of them look like repetitions, yield no variety and beget monotony. Some of them were unintelligible to the poet's readers, such as the healing of the lepers and of the possessed. The author of "The Heliand" did not fail to perceive these obstacles to a poetic treatment of the Gospel narrative, and he strove earnestly to overcome them. He did not base his poem on the four Gospels directly. He probably built it upon the Diatesseron or "Gospel Harmony" of Tatian, or perhaps that of Ammonius' works, combining the narratives of the four Evangelists so as to give a chronologically consecutive history of the Redeemer's life and actions. Of the 184 chapters in Tatian's book he cast out sixty entirely and forty in part. We see our poet knew the value of condensation. The parts omitted are chiefly the records of miracles, but also quite a number of speeches. His aim is to prevent the dragging of the action, and so far as it is possible to do so he has succeeded. But as literary critics purely, we cannot close our eyes to the fact that even in this condensed form the poem often drags from lack of action and excess of speech-making.

He did not confine himself to Tatian's work, however. Modern scholarship has not only proved conclusively that he used other works, but has shown who some of his authorities were. It has established the fact that the worthy minstrel who sang Christ's

praises so loyally and effectively was a man well versed in the theology of his time. The writings of Rhabanus Maurus, the great Abbot of Fulda, one of the most learned men of his day, and the works of the Venerable Bede were especially laid under contribution. He used them not only as guides in matters of doctrine, but also borrowed from their commentaries details not found in the Gospels. In the narrative of the visit of the wise men to the Infant Saviour, for instance, he tells us how in days long past the Prophet Balaam foretold the coming of the Redeemer and the appearance of His wonderful Star.

With these preliminary remarks, we venture to present some details to our readers.

Like the Song of Beowulf, "The Heliand" is written in the old national verse, an alliterative line consisting of two members, each having three or four arses or accented syllables. In this respect "The Heliand" is a true representative of the oldest German poetry. Other features also prove that the poet was well read in the ancient epics of his country. For, as in Homer certain words and phrases are repeated again and again, repetitions which contribute greatly to give to the Greek poems their peculiar coloring, so in "The Heliand" we find similar epic formulas, some of them showing by their mythological character that they were fixed poetic adornments even in pagan times. The dress of our lay is, therefore, thoroughly national.

The style of "The Heliand" is simplicity itself. In vain do we look for the striking metaphors and similes that lend such charm to Homer's immortal verse. To the old German was not given the keen feeling for literary beauty that distinguished the ancient Greek even at the very dawn of Greek poetry. In connecting together the successive incidents of a story the writer exhibits the same artlessness. Frequently the adverb *then* is used to make the connection. Like the authors of the Hildebrandslied and the Beowulf, our poet also is fond of dwelling on a thought by repetition, only he carries this expedient for producing an impression to much greater lengths. Indeed, this trick, bearable in the expression of strong and continued passion by the lyric poet, but rarely happy in poetic narrative, at times leads the singer of "The Heliand" into verbosity and bathos. With this peculiarity may be classed the accumulation of laudatory appositives, especially in speaking of Christ and the Blessed Virgin. Another characteristic of our writer's style is his inclination to substitute a pronoun for the subject of a sentence, introducing the principal word afterwards as an appositive. The aim of this arrangement was to emphasize the word thus postponed. In English it has often a contrary effect.

In a modern translation some of these peculiarities must be sacrificed, and the reader must bear in mind that to an old Saxon what for us is an element of offense was a source of strength and beauty. That our poem, therefore, in many features of its style and composition suffers from a lack of this highest art must be admitted. In spite of this, however, its very simplicity is attractive and impressive—and how attractive and impressive simplicity can be is known to every reader of Homer and the Bible. The dignity of the narrative, partly the outcome of the original story, no doubt, impresses us throughout, and not unfrequently the author rises to true grandeur and sublimity. Who can fail to be impressed by the vigor of the description of the signs preceding the Last Judgment?

Then to Him came in secret His retainers.
 "My Lord, how long," asked they, "shall this world last
 And flourish, ere its hour of doom will come,
 And ere the last day's sun illuminate
 The heaven? When dost Thou contemplate again
 To come upon this earth and judge mankind,
 The quick and dead, good Lord? To know when this
 Shall happen we are anxious, Christ all-ruling."
 Then kindly answer to His men gave Christ,
 The All-Ruler. "That," quoth He, "has our good Lord
 Concealed, the Heavenly Father, so completely
 Hidden, the Ruler of the world, that none
 Of all the sons of men may know the time
 When for this earth shall come this awful day.
 God's angels even, they that ever stand
 Before the Almighty face, even they know not
 The day; nor can they tell when fate decrees
 That He this world will visit, He the great
 Liege-lord of men. My Heavenly Father knows it
 Alone; from others all, both quick and dead,
 It is withheld when He will come to judgment.
 But I may tell you what portentous signs
 Will first appear before He come from heaven
 That solemn day. Then will it come to pass
 That moon and stars will lose their sheen, and both
 Be wrapt in darkness weird. The stars will fall,
 The blazing orbs of heaven; the earth will tremble,
 And quake this world so broad. Yea, many wonders,
 Even such as these, will come to pass. The mighty
 Waters will rage, and ocean with its billows
 Will smite with fear and awe earth-dwelling men.
 The nations then, aghast in throes of terror,
 Will wither all, o'erwhelmed with gruesome horror,
 The people perish. Peace will then be nowhere,
 But everywhere upon the earth will strife
 Arise most bitter; race will rise 'gainst race,
 Kings quarrel, armies march, and death strike down
 Men without number; universal war
 Will reign: indeed, it is a horrid thought
 That men such gory murder will stir up.
 Moreover, plagues will harrow every land,
 And men will die in throngs more numerous
 Than happened e'er before; assailed by illness,
 Some will, as struck by lightning, fall and die,
 Ending their days and losing eke their life.
 Consuming hunger grim pursues the sons of men,
 The worst of famines. Not the least of tortures,
 Which on the day of doom will strike the earth,
 Will be this cruel famine. When you'll see
 These horrors you may know in sooth that near
 To mankind is the last of days, the day
 Of terror; when in power untold will come
 With all the multitude of heavenly hosts
 The Lord in all His glory. Mark! these trees

Are a true image of those dread events.
 For when they sprout and bloom and put forth leaves,
 Display their foliage, then the sons of men
 Know that ere long the summer days will come,
 Gladsome and sunny, days full bright and fair;
 So, also, by the signs I have foretold
 You'll know when comes to men the last of days.
 In truth, say I to you, before this people,
 This generation pass away my words
 Will be fulfilled."

—Heliand II., 4286-4349.

The poetic vocabulary, the metre and the style of "The Heliand," as we have said, was truly national. But how could the poet treat the subject in such a way as to make Christ's person and mission intelligible to his newly converted countrymen? Here a formidable problem faced our author. To a Saxon of the ninth century, lord or retainer, the activity of Our Saviour as the greatest of prophets and teachers was plainly a mystery. Of philosophic lore they had no idea, and their religious conceptions hardly extended beyond belief in their traditional gods and the observance of the sacrifices and ceremonies prescribed by ancestral usage. What they honored was nobility, wisdom in council, bravery, the devotion of the follower to his chief and conversely the unswerving loyalty of the chief to his men. Now, while the divine heroism of Jesus far surpasses the heroism of all, even of the boldest warriors, it is yet of a very different type, and the Apostles and disciples of Holy Scripture are characters far removed from the faithful, daring, ruthless German warriors, who rejoiced in the battle as in a wedding feast. But there was no help for it. If the poet wished to speak to the hearts of his countrymen, if he wished to reach their sympathies and arouse in them a fiery enthusiasm for the Lord Christ, he must portray Jesus to them from a point of view that was not beyond their intelligence, their sympathies and their traditional ideas. This, accordingly, is what he has done, and the solution of this problem without materially distorting the Christian conception of the Redeemer and the redemption, is assuredly no mean literary achievement. Throughout the poem the singer, mindful that Christ as God was the All-ruling King of the universe, and as man the scion of David's royal race, represents Him as the great Liege-lord to whom all men owe fealty. He is "the strongest and most powerful of Kings," "the folk-King," "the Shepherd of the land." His Apostles and disciples are His liegemen, faithful and true, ready to do Him service, but expecting in return material evidence of His generosity. Fishermen though they are, they are all "nobly born" and "men of wisdom." St. Matthew, the Roman tithe gatherer, appears as a liegeman of the Cæsar of Rome, who leaves his master's service and becomes Christ's follower, because Christ is a greater Lord and will reward him more liberally.

The Scripture narrative, it is true, offers but few occasions to paint the Apostles as valiant warriors fighting for their Chief; but these occasions our poet seizes with ardor. Here is the story of Peter drawing his sword and smiting Malchus:

But up the hillside ran some daring men,
 Bold they of heart, determined in their souls;
 Against Him rushed they, filled with spite and hate,
 Until the throng hemmed in the Saviour Christ.
 Downcast and gloomy stood Christ's followers,
 Though men of wisdom, when they saw these deeds
 Of wickedness, and to their Lord they spake.
 "Were it Thy bidding now, Almighty Lord,"
 Quoth they, "that by the falchion's edge or point
 Of spear we die, certes nothing were so sweet
 As for our Liege-lord here to fall, death-pale
 With gory wounds." Then wrath-inflamed and quick
 The warrior Simon Peter seethed and boiled,
 So that he could not say a single word.
 Full wroth in heart was he that men his Lord
 Should dare to fetter. Mad with pain and gloom,
 He ran to stand before his King, hard by
 His Lord. Far famed his valor, daring was
 His heart, but forth he drew his weapon, drew
 The falchion at his side, and leaped against
 The foremost of the foes with might and main;
 And with the sharp edge of his blade smote Malchus
 Upon his right side, marked him with his sword.
 His ear was severed, wounded was his head,
 That from the blow both ear and cheek ran gory;
 And from the gash the blood leaped forth in streams,
 Welling from out his wounds. Then smitten sore
 Was Malchus, the foremost of His foes.
 Fast scattered then the throng; they feared his steel.
 Then spoke the Son of God to Simon Peter,
 And bade him place within its sheath his blade.

—Heliand II., 4856-4886.

In the same way, when some of our Lord's kinsmen will not hear of His going up to Jerusalem, the poet with manifest warmth dwells on St. Thomas' proposal that the Apostles accompany their Lord and shed their blood for Him. In this way we see he succeeds fairly well in shaping the characters of the Gospel to fit the ideals of the warlike Saxon. But there are incidents in the sacred narrative which defied all his skill. To make Christ, the greatest of Liege-lords and mightiest of Kings, enter Jerusalem on Palm Sunday riding on an ass, was not to be tolerated. It would have jarred every Saxon prejudice. Still the author had too much respect for the sacred narrative where it relates to Our Saviour Himself to change it. So he omits not only the ass, but the entire scene. In the same way he passes over in silence Christ's healing of lepers, a sickness unknown to the Saxons. Christ's injunction to offer the left cheek to the smiter of the right was *caviare* to the Saxon general and is prudently cut out. On the other hand, where the sacred story enables him to bring out scenes and occupations familiar to his people, the author of "The Heliand" eagerly seizes them. The Saxons dwelt on the shores of the German Ocean. They were bold, enthusiastic mariners, at home on the blue waters

of the ocean, fearless amid the buffetings of the storm and the billows. Mark how the poet paints the storm on Lake Genesareth:

Hither had come from every land and nation
A mighty throng to honor Christ and offer
Homage to this great Lord, the Son of God.
The All-Ruler, with His followers, withdrew
To sail upon a lake in Galilee,
A flowing sea. The rest of His companions
He bade proceed, while He with some few men
Embarked upon a ship—the Saviour Christ—
To rest, for He was weary from the way.
Up hoisted then their sails the weatherwise
Among His men; the favoring wind impelled
Their pinnace o'er the water, till He came
Unto the middle of the lake, the All-Ruler,
With His retainers. Then began the wind
To rage; up rose a tempest, billows swelled.
The heavens were wrapt in gloom, the sea commenced
To roll, the waters wrestled with the winds;
Fright smote the men. The lake grew wild and wilder;
The sailors all despair'd of life. Then roused
They with their words the Guardian of the world;
Told Him the fierceness of the storm, and asked
That Christ the Saviour save them from the waves,
"Or⁴ we shall perish here upon this sea,
Mid awful horrors."

—Heliand II, 2231-2250.

We cannot fail to recognize the truth and vigor of the picture here presented, and feel that only a man at home on the sea and familiar with its wild whims could have painted it. We note especially the striking image of the winds wrestling with the waves. But the whole passage is full of life and strength.

The passion of these primitive sons of the German forests for war and its wild scenes we have already dwelt upon. Another national characteristic was their fondness for feasts and banquets. When they could not give vent to their mad spirits on the battlefield or in the chase, they gave themselves up to the pleasures of the cup and the table, amid the display of a barbaric magnificence. Whenever, therefore, the sacred narrative affords an opportunity to our author to gratify the national taste in this particular he is not slow to seize it. Though the Scripture story be simple and unpretending, he becomes eloquent and enlarges the picture. Take his account of the marriage of Cana, for instance:

Three days thereafter into Galilee
Went forth the Liege-lord of this multitude.
There was He bidden to a feast, the Son
Of God. There was the wedding of a bride,
A winsome maid. There Mary, too, had come,
Together with her Son—the blessed Maiden.
The Mother of the Sovereign Lord of all
Went to this place with His retainers—God's
Own Son—into the lofty mansion, where the throng
The Jews were feasting in the spacious hall.
He, too, sat at the banquet and made known
That He had power divine, strength from the Father
And from the Holy Spirit, the All-Ruler's
Wisdom. Inside the crowd was gay; reveled

⁴ The change from indirect to direct discourse and *vice versa* is quite common in the Heliand.

The guests full merry, frolicksome the men.
 In came the attendants; butlers came with cups,
 Fetched in the sparkling wine in goblets huge
 And mighty tankards. Through the hall there bustled
 A lively throng of guests fair to be seen.
 Now on their benches men were filled with mirth,
 And jolly were they all. Just then the wine
 Gave out; no more of joy-inspiring drink
 Then had the hosts, for nowhere in the house
 Was found a single cup which to the throng
 The butlers might bring in: the jars were void.
 Ere long Christ's Mother, fairest of all women,
 Remark'd their wants and sought out her dear Child,
 Even her own Son, and told Him that the hosts
 Had no more wine to offer to the guests.
 Then earnestly she begged the holy Christ
 Their needs to help and give them kindly aid.
 —Holland II, 1994-2023.

The early lines of this passage afford some striking examples of the poet's stylistic peculiarities, the cumulation of appositives, the postponement of the subject and the repetition of the same thought to lay stress on it. We observe, too, that the bridal house, simple and commonplace in the original text, becomes a great mansion with spacious halls, for the mighty Chief, in the old Saxon's ideas, would surely not deign to make merry in any but a lordly house. The feasting scene is thoroughly national. The guests, partly seated on benches, partly roaming through the large hall, the mighty tankards (*alofatum*—ale vats the original calls them), the bustling cup-bearers, the merry company—all these are characteristic additions to the unadorned story in the Gospel. They exhibit the creative side of the poet and interest us as pictures of old German—not Jewish—life. They are incorrect, as the costumes and paraphernalia of Raphael's Madonnas are incorrect, but they give life and vigor to the poem.

We see, then, how truly "The Heliand" reflects the manners and the ideas of the people among which it originated. Another feature showing the same tendency is the loyalty of the writer to the Emperor and his vigorous insistence upon obedience to his authority. The Saxons had resisted Charlemagne to the utmost, but when at last their Duke Widukind recognized the imperial sovereignty he did so honorably and loyally. This spirit of loyalty, the many favors conferred on the Church by the Carolingian house, as well as the consistent teaching of the Church, dictated the following passage. Possibly, too, it was inspired by the fact that the poem was suggested by the widow of Louis the Pious. At all events, it is an interesting expression of the author's views on the duty of the faithful to governors:

Among the people there a haughty warrior;
 The King's retainer saw they; he was Cæsar's
 Servant, said he, the wielder of his power.
 Next Simon Peter he addressed; declared
 He had been sent to warn all men to pay

Their tithes, the taxes due the Emperor's court.
 "To pay them with his choicest treasures no man
 Tarries a day; thy Master all alone
 Forbears to pay them. Certes imperial Cæsar,
 My lord, will not be pleased to hear these tidings."
 Forthwith went Peter then to tell his Lord,
 But Christ already knew his message; naught
 From Him was hid: He knew the minds of all.
 He bade his far-famed liege-man Simon Peter
 Take out his net and throw it in the sea.
 "The first fish thou wilt catch draw from the water
 And cleave its chin, then find within its jaw
 Some golden coin. This take at once and pay
 Thy tithes and mine, just as the man demands."
 Forth went the fisherman, good Simon Peter.
 Into the sea, the waves, he flung his net,
 Drew up with both his hands a struggling fish;
 Then clove its chin, and from within its jaw
 Took out the golden coin. Whate'er the Son
 Of Man had bidden him to do he did.
 Thus glorified was Christ's almighty power,
 And shown how all shall pay the debt, the tithes,
 Whatever they may owe unto their liege-lord.
 Never withhold from him his dues, nor yet
 Contemn him in your hearts, but generous be
 To him in mind and serve him faithfully.
 Thus will you do God's will and eek obtain
 The emperor's favor.

—Heliand II., 3183-3225.

The Carolingian house, Pepin, Charles and his son Louis, had ever been loyal sons of the Church and protectors of the Holy See. St. Boniface and his successors had borne the glad tidings of the Gospel to the pagans of Germany, commissioned by the Pope himself. Loyal faith to St. Peter's successor inspired the converted and their spiritual guides. The evidence of this feeling is manifest in "The Heliand." Next to Christ Peter, it is true, is the most striking character in the Gospel narrative. But this prominence the poet of "The Heliand" strongly accentuates. This is already clear from some of the excerpts cited above, notably in the story of Peter's smiting of Malchus. Even more marked is this admiration, coupled with a certain loving sympathy in the verses which relate how Christ gave to Peter the power of the keys. As it is, moreover, from a literary point of view one of the most striking passages in the poem, we do not hesitate to subjoin it:

Then spake again the Christ, the Lord all-powerful:
 "Who say ye that I am, retainers mine,
 Dear men?" Not backward then was Simon Peter;
 Quick answered he, the one for all; for bold
 Was he of spirit, had a daring heart,
 And was most loyal to his Lord and King:
 "Thou art in very truth the All-Ruler's Son,
 Son of the living God, who made this world,
 Christ, everlasting King; so say we, all
 Thy followers, that Thou art God Himself,
 The best of Saviours." Then in turn replied
 His Lord: "Full blest art, Simon, thou, the son
 Of Jonas. Not in thy thoughts nor thy mind
 Hast thou conceived this answer; no man's tongue
 Revealed it to thee, but Almighty God,
 The Father. Thee of all the sons of men
 Hath He inspired to speak so plainly now
 The truth mysterious; great thy reward.
 Pure is the faith thy soul hath in the Lord.

Thy soul is like a flint; firm like a rock
 Art thou; hence men shall call thee Holy Peter,
 And on this rock will I erect my Church,
 God's holy house. There shall his household ever
 Gather in happiness. Against thy mighty power
 Ne'er shall the gates of hell prevail. To thee
 I give the keys of heaven, that after Me
 Thou mayest sway the Christian nations all,
 That unto thee go forth men's spirits alway.
 Great be thy power. Whom of the sons of men
 Thou choose to bind here on the earth, to him
 Is heaven locked, and hell to him is opened
 The burning fire; and whom thou wilt unbind,
 Loosen his hands, to him is heaven unlocked,
 The realm of light and everlasting life,
 God's verdant pasture. This is my reward
 For thy strong faith. Not yet shalt thou make known
 To these men here, this throng, that I am the Christ,
 Mighty, God's only Son. Me guiltless shall
 Hereafter put in gyves the Jews and torture
 Beyond belief. Much suffering they'll inflict
 Upon me with the spear; they will assail
 My life with keenest glaive and shed my blood.
 But on the third day from the dead I'll rise
 And to the earth return through our Lord's power."
 Then great alarm the best of liegemen seized,
 Good Simon Peter: terror filled his heart,
 And to his Lord the hero spoke in secret.
 "Ne'er will Almighty God," quoth he, "the All-Ruler,
 Permit that Thou, my Lord, shall suffer torture
 So great among these folk: no need is there
 For this, my holy Lord." To him replied
 His Lord, the famed, the mighty Christ, for gracious
 Was He to Peter: "What! wouldst thou oppose
 My will, thou best of liegemen? Well thou know'st
 The weakness of the people here, but not
 The strength of God, that I must show to men.
 In truth I tell thee that among these men,
 These followers of mine, some will not die,
 Not go to the hereafter, till they see
 The light of heaven and God's own kingdom."

—Helland II., 3051-3107.

The last few lines refer to Christ's transfiguration, which follows directly after the scene just described and in which Peter again has a prominent share. It is impossible not to feel the closeness of the ties between Peter and Our Saviour while reading the recital just quoted, nor to admire the skill with which the poet impresses this upon us.

We have now a sufficiently clear insight into the method of our poet. We understand how he renders his story, so startlingly strange to his countrymen, less repellent, or rather how he enlists their sympathies on behalf of the Redeemer. He certainly shows no little genius in solving this problem. Without infringing on the essential truth of Christ's history, without lowering the Saviour's dignity and without introducing any elements that are ludicrous or grotesque, he presents to his hearers the overwhelming story of our redemption. Even to-day and on us who are so keenly sensitive to the slightest departures from correctness of local coloring, the poem makes an impression of grandeur and nobility. How much greater must have been the effect on those for whom it was written!

With the story of the visit of the three Magi to Bethlehem, which will enable the reader to appreciate the poet's manner of dealing with narrative passages and may be regarded not as a passage selected for its especial interest, but as a specimen of the general flow of his narrative, we close our extract :

Then from the temple and Jerusalem
Went Joseph home, and Mary, too, his spouse;
And in their company was e'er the King
Of Heaven, the Lord's own Son, of all the Guardian.
No further now the tidings of His birth
Spread through the world, for such was the decree
Of heaven's great King. Though all the good men there
Acknowledged Christ, yet at the royal court
The news reached not the men who in their hearts
Were bitter; hid from them remained the glad some
Tidings until there came far from the East
Into that land three sages, men most wise
And warriors bold, by distant weary ways.
A brilliant star their guide, the Son of God
They sought with honest hearts and wished to bow
Their knees before Him, be His followers true.
God's will impelled them to the Holy Land,
And there they found the mighty Herod sitting
In lofty hall, the rudely spoken king,
The wrathful lord, surrounded by his henchmen.
At all times lusted he for gore and slaughter.
Then the good sages, using words most fair,
As it beseemed them speaking to the king,
Addressed him in his palace. Soon in turn
He asked what message they had brought, and questioned
The bold wayfarers. "Bring you wroughten gold
Or costly gifts for any man? And why
Have you come here by tolful travel? Look!
You come from distant lands, from nations strange.
Well-born you are, I see of noble stock;
Never before have men like you come hither
From other countries since I rule this people,
Govern this mighty realm. Now tell me truly,
Before these lords assembled, why ye came
To this my country?" Thereupon in turn
Spake out the Eastern heroes, men of wit.
"We will tell thee truly," quoth they, "what's our errand,
Say without guile why we have come upon
This voyage from the East to this thy land.
In bygone days there dwelt among us seers
Noble and wise, who told of future blessings,
Promised us help, in truthful words, from heaven.
Then, too, was there a learned man and sage
Full of experience. Long, yes, long ago
Lived this our ancestor in Eastern lands.
Never since then was there a man so wise
Of speech; the word of God would he make known
Because the Lord of men had given him power
To learn his words of wisdom here on earth.
Hence was his knowledge great, the hero's learning.
When came his time to go from hence, depart
From home and kin, to bid farewell to all
The bustling haunts of men, and seek the life
Beyond, he summoned to his side the youths
He had taught, his heirs, and truthfully foretold
To these, his scholars, all that since befell
Our land, that happened upon earth. He said
Unto this orb would come a king far famed,
Mighty, of lineage unexcelled, quoth, that
The Son of God He would be, quoth, that on earth
Forever He would rule and eke in heaven.
He said that on the very day His blessed
Mother would bear Him to this earth, that day
A brilliant star would in the Orient shine;
Such star as ne'er was seen 'twixt earth and heaven,
Nor elsewhere such a babe nor such a sign.

Enjoined that three men of our nation then
 Set forth to adore Him; bade them bear in mind
 His words when they beheld rise in the East
 That sign from God; bade them prepare forthwith,
 And bade us follow it where'er it led
 Forward to western lands, in heaven above.
 All this has happened now, and by the power
 Of God has come to pass. Conceived and born
 Is now the dauntless king and strong.
 We saw His star resplendent shine in heaven, His sign
 Even as the holy Lord Himself ordained,
 The Mighty One Himself. From morn to morn
 We saw His star refulgent blaze in heaven;
 And hitherward o'er roads, through forests dense
 We followed it for many days. Our ardent
 Desire it was to see Him and to know
 Where we should seek the King within this realm
 Of Cæsar. Tell us now from which of all
 These countless tribes has He been born?" In heart
 Grew Herod sad, his mind was filled with care,
 His thoughts were anxious; he had heard the sages
 Declare that he must own an Over-Lord,
 A king far mightier, of noble stock.
 Among his liegemen stronger summoned he
 Forthwith of all that in Jerusalem
 Were dwelling, those well versed in foreign tongues,
 In book lore wise. With eager words the king
 Then questioned he this man of bitter spite,
 The Jewish King, where Christ, the Prince of Peace,
 Was to be born. In answer, then, at once
 Spake forth these folk, these men of truth, and said
 They knew that Christ was destined to be born
 In Bethlehem. "'Tis written in our books,
 Our sacred writings; so the prophets, too,
 Far-seeing sages, men most wise, inspired
 By God, foretold that to this world should come
 From Bethlehem the Shepherd of our towns,
 Our country's Guardian, dear and mighty Ruler,
 Who is to sway the nation of the Jews,
 And be a gracious gift to many tribes
 Upon the earth." Then learnt I furthermore
 That soon thereafter the sudden-minded king
 Told to the travelers the prophet's words,
 Even to the men that came from distant parts,
 From foreign lands. Enquired he afterwards
 When had they first beheld in Eastern climes
 The royal star appear, the sign refulgent,
 Blaze high in heavens. Nought desired they then
 From Herod to withhold, but told the truth.
 Then onward urged he them to fare, to sift
 The truth of their strange tidings and the facts
 About the coming of the child. The king,
 The ruler of the Jews, then charged the three
 Wise men, before they set out for the East,
 To apprise him where the new-born King he'd seek
 In his own palace, quoth, he wished to worship
 The Child there with his courtiers, though he meant
 With ruthless steel to kill the Babe divine.
 But God, the All-Ruler, then made manifest
 His power; again appeared above the clouds
 The blazing sign. The three wise men prepared
 To start forthwith. Thence traveled they in haste
 Upon this errand, eager they to seek
 The Son of God. No retinue had they.
 The three were all alone. But wise they were,
 And full of foresight, who had brought their gifts
 To offer to the Lord of heaven and earth,
 To watch where moved above the twinkling star,
 God's sign. They soon beheld it there announcing
 The Saviour's birth to all the world. Intently
 They went where led the star, obeyed its guidance
 With God's sure help until the way-worn men
 Beheld at last the blazing sign of God
 Halt high in heaven most brilliant o'er the house
 Where dwelt the Holy Babe, flashed forth the star,

And where the Virgin Mother fondly nursed Him
As her beseemed. Joy thrilled the heroes' hearts,
For by this sign they knew that they had found
The Prince of Peace divine, the King of heaven.
The mansion then they entered, bearing gifts,
These way-worn wanderers, princes from the East,
And saw the Babe was Christ, the All-Ruler; then
The travelers fell on their knees before
The Babe, and as a King they greeted Him;
Brought Him their presents, gold and incense, symbols
Of Godship true, and myrrh they gave withal.
His men stood ready, loyal to their master,
And in their hands received the gifts so fair
In courtly ways. The wise men thereupon
Entered the house; the way-worn wayfarers
Entered the hall for guests. There in the night
God's angel in their sleep showed them a dream;
The Lord Himself had willed it so, the All-Ruler.
With mandate clear He bade them go from thence
By other ways and journey home, and shun
Herod on their return, that wicked-hearted man
And cruel, bloody king. Soon morning fair
Descended on the earth; the wise men then
Spoke of their dreams. The All-Ruler's mandate then
Clearly they recognized, for in them dwelt
Wisdom abounding. Next besought the Lord,
The King of heaven sublime, that they might still
Deserve His grace and do His will; each morn,
Said they, they turned their loyal minds to Him,
Their loyal hearts. Then went from thence the men,
The Eastern heroes, as God's angel bade them.

We have already said that mediæval chronicles contain no record of the appreciation in which "The Heliand" was held by its contemporaries and the middle ages in general. That it was well received and achieved the end for which it was written, we may perhaps infer from the fact that not long after its composition, indeed during the same tenth century, a similar poem was composed in the High German language, then in its infancy. This was the "Gospel Harmony" of Ottfried, a monk of Weissenburg, a town in Alsace. Besides the difference of dialect, what distinguishes Ottfried's work from "The Heliand" is the fact that it is written in rhymed and not in alliterative verse. Indeed it is perhaps the oldest German rhymed poem that has come down to us. However, modern critics unanimously agree that in poetic skill and inspiration the monk of Weissenburg ranks far below the author of "The Heliand." If "The Heliand" was soon lost sight of in the middle ages may probably be due to its dress. It is almost the last German poem written in alliterative verse, and such is the charm of rhyme, especially for less refined, that once the new kind of verse had been introduced into German literature, people lost their taste for the ancient unrhymed poetry.

We have spread before our readers the story of this most ancient specimen of Christian literature in Germany; we have striven to picture the conditions under which it was composed and the difficulties with which the old minstrel was forced to contend; we have sought to exhibit in a clear light the excellencies and weaknesses

of the epic, and we have even ventured in a modest translation to acquaint our readers with the stylistic peculiarities that characterize it. If by these means we have succeeded in enabling them to realize to some degree the fact that even in those early days Christianity inspired the old Saxon singer with true poetic feeling, and direct their attention to the many treasures of literature which mediæval Europe accumulated, we shall think that these pages have not been written in vain.

CHARLES G. HERBERMANN.

New York, N. Y.

Scientific Chronicle

SOME RECENT EXPERIMENTS AND LIFE.

Within the last few months many of our newspapers and magazines, in their inordinate desire for the sensational, have published remarkable stories of the production—"creation" some have called it—of life by artificial means. These stories they have attempted to substantiate by a description of one or other of two series of experiments carried on respectively by Mr. John Butler Burke at Cambridge, England, and by Professor Jacques Loeb, of the University of California. The experimenters themselves are not responsible for the exaggerated claims of these newspaper writers. Striking as their discoveries are, they do not appeal to those who know as settling the question of the origin of life; to some of these, indeed, that much-mooted problem is as far from an experimental solution as ever.

Dr. Burke is engaged in research work in the Cavendish Laboratory of Cambridge University. In the course of this work he was led to try the effect of a salt of radium on a gelatine culture medium, such as is used for generating bacteria in commonly known as bouillon. A small hermetically sealed tube containing salt (bromide of radium in one case, chloride in another) was placed in a tube of bouillon, which was in turn stopped up with cotton wool and sterilized at a temperature of about 130 degrees C. for about thirty minutes. This sterilization would effectually kill off all traces of organic life, for it will be remembered that Pasteur and others have established the fact that the highest temperature at which organic life is possible is 113 degrees F., or 45 degrees C. About two and one-half milligrams of the bromide were used, and the small sealed tubes were broken by means of a wire passing to the outside of the larger tube, allowing the salt to drop on the surface of the gelatine. After a lapse of twenty-four hours in the case of the bromide, and of three or four days for the chloride, a culture-like growth was observed in the gelatine which extended for a depth of a centimeter beneath the surface. That these were not organisms, left behind because of imperfect sterilization of the bouillon, was evidenced by the fact that "control" tubes of bouillon, sterilized as the others, but containing no radium, exhibited no trace of contamination after the same length of time.

The small bodies making up the growth were clearly not

microbes, neither bacteria, for they gave no sub-culture when transferred to fresh media; nor microbes of another kind, as after a month or six weeks the bodies resulting from their action were too small to be classed as microbes. When the original cultures were heated and reesterilized the small bodies disappeared temporarily. Disappearance was likewise caused by the action of diffused daylight, but the bodies again made their appearance when the tubes were placed in the dark. A stronger proof that they were not microbes was that they dissolved in warm water. The suggestion that they might be crystals was made, but in Dr. Burke's opinion they could not be. They were too small, and the various phenomena of motion, growth, sub-division, etc., would preclude this explanation. Dr. Burke calls them "highly organized bodies," and he adds: "The stoppage of growth at a particular stage of development is a clear indication of a continuous adjustment of internal to external relations, and thus suggests vitality." He says that they cannot be identified with microbes on the one hand nor with crystals on the other, and dubs them "radiobes," the name suggesting their origin and resemblance to living cells. It seems clear from his writings that he would like to call them living things, for he says again: "The continuity of structure, assimilation and growth, and the sub-division, together with the nucleated structure as shown in a few of the best specimens, suggests that they are entitled to be classed among living things, in the sense in which we use the words, whether we call them bacteria or not."

We would like to point out just here to those who at once conclude that life has been at last produced artificially, that it will take more than a mere suggestion to establish such a tremendous conclusion. Various experimenters have succeeded in producing artificial cells that imitate living cells in many wonderful ways, but it is a long step from the imitation to the reality. The action and movements of the counterfeits can be readily explained by the action of known physical and chemical laws, and these "radiobes" are no exception. Sir William Ramsay, in an article in the *Independent*, has given an explanation that will appeal to an unbiased judgment as perfectly satisfactory. Calling to mind the fact that radium gives off helium by the decomposition of the radium emanation, that besides heat being evolved during this decomposition, a certain amount of chemical energy is liberated, which can bring about the decomposition of the water in which the emanation may be dissolved, that the dissolved emanation has the "curious property of coagulating white of egg or albumen, he continues: "A possible explanation appears to me to be suggested by some of the facts which I have adduced. Mr. Burke made use of solid radium

bromide in fine powder. He sprinkled a few minute grains on a gelatine broth medium, possibly somewhat soft, so that the granules would sink slowly beneath the surface. Once there they would dissolve in and decompose the water, liberating oxygen and hydrogen, together with emanations, which would remain mixed with these gases. The gases would form minute bubbles, probably of microscopic dimensions, and the coagulating action of the emanation on the albumen of the liquor would surround each with a skin, so that the product would appear like a cell; its contents, however, would be gas, or, rather, a mixture of the gases oxygen and hydrogen. The emanation, enclosed in such a sack, would still decompose water, for enough would diffuse through the walls of the sack, which, moreover, would naturally be moist. The accumulation of more gas would almost certainly burst the walls of the cell, and almost equally certainly in one or two places. Through the cracks a gas would issue, carrying with it the emanation, and with it the property of coagulating the walls of a fresh cell. The result of the original bubble would resemble an yeast cell, and the second cell a bud, or perhaps more than one if the original cell happened to burst. This process would necessarily be repeated as long as the radium continued to evolve emanation, which would be for the best part of a thousand years. The 'life,' therefore, would be a long one, and the 'budding' would impress itself on an observer as equally continuous with that of a living organism."

The experiments of Dr. Loeb had in view the solution of three problems—among others, hybridization, artificial parthenogenesis and animal heliotropism. In the first he succeeded in producing hybrids from two species of animals which were not closely related; in the third he made some interesting discoveries regarding the causes of the turning towards the light which certain animals exhibit. The second problem is the one which has particularly attracted the attention of the newspapers. Dr. Loeb wished to throw light on the question of parthenogenesis, that process by which the eggs of certain animals begin to segment without union with the sperm. Some animals do this naturally. The inquiry was, could it be brought about that animals whose eggs under natural conditions need union with the sperm in order to segment be made to develop without this union by chemical, physical or mechanical means? The experiments yield an affirmative answer. Eggs of *Arbacia* (one of the sea urchins) and of *Chaetopterus*, a marine worm, were caused to segment by merely increasing the concentration of sea water by the addition of magnesium, potassium, sodium or calcium chlorides. There was no "creation" of life. The eggs were already living. They were caused to divide by

artificial means, the stimulating effect of the spermatozoon in hastening segmentation and whatever other effect the spermatozoon might have being accomplished by the means described. For a complete review of these experiments the reader is referred to Dr. Loeb's two volumes of "Studies in General Physiology."

TERRESTRIAL MAGNETISM.

Under the auspices of the Carnegie Institution a systematic study of the problems of terrestrial magnetism is to be made. It may prove of interest to know the nature of the work to be accomplished. Something has already been done. The study of the secular variation of the earth's magnetism is well enough advanced to enable field work in this line to be carried on with success. Besides this, a work on the magnetic disturbance due to the eruption of Mount Pelée will be published this year. Of the work still to be accomplished there will be made a general study of the laws of diurnal variation and a special investigation of magnetic storms. Probably the most important portion of the work, at least from a practical standpoint, will be the magnetic survey of the Pacific Ocean. A special steamer will be devoted to this, and the declination, horizontal intensity, total intensity and dip will be accurately determined for the whole Pacific. There will be an investigation of magnetic disturbances carried on in conjunction with the Carnegie Solar Research Laboratory on Mount Wilson in California. Eclipse work was done on August 30 on the Island of Majorca.

CAPE TO CAIRO RAILWAY.

The completion of the bridge over the Zambesi river marks the completion of an important link in the great chain which will join the Cape with Cairo. The bridge is a steel arch of 500 feet span. The gorge of the river is 400 feet below and the depth of water estimated at several hundred feet. During the construction of the bridge a net was spread beneath the workmen and was the means of saving several lives. The journey to Cairo or the Cape is not all to be made by rail. Of the 5,611 miles to be traversed, 1,800 miles will be made by steamer; 400 of these will be made on Lake Tanganyika, the remainder on other lakes and the Nile. Two thousand seven hundred and seventy miles of the remaining rail route have been completed.

NEW FEATS IN WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY.

On a recent voyage the *Campania* kept up communication with Poldhu, Cornwall, until 2,100 miles out, and began to communicate with Nantucket, Massachusetts, when 1,800 miles from Sandy Hook. Experts say that she could have kept up communication with Europe for the whole of the voyage. M. Edouard Branly in some recent laboratory experiments showed that an operator with a wireless apparatus could start and stop an electric motor, turn on and off a system of incandescent lights and touch off an explosive mine. And he further showed that these, by a sort of attuning process, could be selected at will.

OXIDIZING ATMOSPHERIC NITROGEN.

Accounts have appeared at various times in these pages of methods devised to make the nitrogen of the atmosphere commercially available in fertilizers. In a recent method devised by Professor Eschweiler, of Hanover, a stream of air mixed with steam is passed over a mass of peat in a state of slow combustion. In the process the steam is decomposed, the hydrogen uniting with the nitrogen of the air and of the peat to form ammonia. The ammonia is then taken up by sulfuric acid. It has been claimed that the ammonium sulfate thus formed can be manufactured at a commercial price.

ASTRONOMICAL NOTES.

RECENT OBSERVATIONS OF MARS.—Professor Percival Lowell, of Flagstaff Observatory, Arizona, the eminent authority on the planet Mars, writes in regard to the new North Polar cap on the planet that he observed the first frost on May 19, which corresponds to August 20 on our calendar, and is 126 days after the summer solstice in the northern hemisphere of Mars. In 1903 the first frost effects were observed about 128 days after. On March 28 he telegraphed to Professor Pickering that some of the canals had been photographed by Mr. Lampland, some appearing on more than twenty plates. In this connection it is interesting to note that the Janssen Medal of the French Astronomical Society was awarded in 1904 to Professor Lowell for his work on Mars, it being the first

and only medal ever awarded for the study and interpretation of the surface features on Mars.

SOLAR ACTIVITY.—On July 6 to 13 a group of sunspots was visible which increased to roughly 100,000 miles in the aggregate and was visible to the naked eye. On July 10 smaller spots with two well defined nuclei appeared, and on July 14 both groups were visible to the properly protected naked eye at once, the second time this has occurred this year.

OBSERVATIONS OF JUPITER'S NEW SATELLITES.—It was announced on July 30 that Dr. Albrecht had observed the sixth satellite of Jupiter on three nights in July with the Crossley reflector of the Lick Observatory. With the same instrument he observed the seventh satellite on the 7th, 9th and 10th of August.

SOME REFINEMENTS OF MECHANICAL SCIENCE.—The above is a title of an address recently delivered by Mr. Ambrose Swasey, of the well-known firm of instrument makers of Cleveland, Ohio. In the course of the address he called attention to some recent feats in dividing and measuring linear valves. A plane surface on speculum metal was made recently by Brashear that was in error only one-four-hundred-thousandth of an inch. Regarding another similar feat we quote a paragraph from *Popular Astronomy*:

"Professor Michaelson conceived the idea that standards of length should be measured by wave lengths of light to be permanent in case of destruction. By the aid of Mr. Brashear this work has been so successful that Professor Michaelson was invited to continue it at the Bureau of Weights and Measures at Sèvres, France, where the standard meter was kept in an underground vault and inspected only at long intervals or when needed for important tests. The final result of the experiments, which occupied nearly a year, shows that there are 1,553,164.5 wave lengths of red cadmium light in the French standard meter at 15 degrees centigrade. So great is the accuracy of these experiments that they can be repeated within one part in two millions."

DISCOVERY OF A TENTH SATELLITE TO SATURN.—This has been discovered by Professor W. H. Pickering, who also discovered the ninth satellite to the same planet. This latest satellite is of the twentieth magnitude, has a period of 21 days and a direct orbital motion, as far as can be at present ascertained.

THE RETIREMENT OF A NOTED ASTRONOMER.—The many students of Professor Charles A. Young's works on astronomy—and their number is legion—will learn with regret of his retirement from active teaching work at Princeton University, where he had been professor of astronomy and director of the Halstead Observatory for twenty-eight years. The event was noteworthy not only

from the fact that it marked the close of more than fifty years of devoted work in his favorite science, but also because of the position Professor Young held as a scientist, who united indefatigable industry and enterprise to a rarely discriminative judgment and a strict regard for truth in a remarkable way. Among his scientific achievements may be mentioned the first photograph of a solar prominence, made in 1870, which was not highly successful because of the limitations of the wet plate process; the development of the use of the spectroscope in astronomy and its application to the observation of the spectrum of the corona, and the first observation of the "flash spectrum." The dark lines of the normal solar spectrum have been supposed to be due to the absorption of the light emitted by the minute solid or liquid particles which go to form the photosphere, the absorption being made by a cooler layer, in which the photospheric clouds float and which is made up of the same vapors as the clouds themselves. If this is the case, if the photosphere could be cut off from view, we should obtain a bright spectrum of these same lines from that part of the cooler layer projecting beyond the photosphere. This projecting portion is seen in a favorable position for this observation at the time of a total eclipse of the sun for the few seconds the shadow of the moon is just tangent on the inside to the solar disk. It should then give a bright line spectrum. Professor Young first observed this spectrum, called the "flash spectrum" from the fact of its visibility for a few seconds only, in 1870. It was photographed in 1896 and 1898. One other pioneer work was Professor Young's measurement of the rotation of the sun by means of Doppler's principle, from the relative displacement of the lines of the spectrum on the approaching and receding limbs of the sun.

GEOLOGICAL NOTES.

UNDERGROUND WATER RESOURCES OF THE CENTRAL GREAT PLAINS.—The Central Great Plains include the greater portions of South Dakota, Nebraska and Kansas and the eastern portions of Colorado and Wyoming, an area of about one-half million square miles. The strata of sandstone and sand, which overlies relatively impermeable shales and limestones, outcrop on the west of the region at an altitude of about 4,000 feet above sea level and slope to the east. The water evidently enters the sandstone at this outcrop, and in the trough of the central portion of the plains is under great pressure. The water in some wells that have been sunk is

under a pressure of one hundred and fifty pounds per square inch. In two it is slightly over two hundred. Over 1,000 wells east of the Missouri are estimated to flow 7,000,000 gallons a day. One well at Woonsocket, South Dakota, sent out a three-inch stream 97 feet into the air, while another at Springfield flows 3,292 gallons per minute.

MINERAL WEALTH OF THE UNITED STATES.—According to statistics issued by the United States Census Bureau, the value of the mineral product in the United States during 1902 was more than \$1,000,000,000. Of this amount nearly \$290,000,000 represented the value of the bituminous coal mined; nearly \$90,000,000 that of the gold and silver; the anthracite coal was worth somewhat over \$75,000,000, the petroleum about \$70,000,000 and the iron ore \$65,000,000, approximately. The report noted the increased use of electricity in mining, due without doubt to the utilization of water courses for generative purposes.

THE LARGEST DIAMOND.—A diamond has been recently found at the Premier Mine, Transvaal, which weighs 9,600.5 grains Troy, or 1.37 pounds avoirdupois, three times the weight of the largest previously known. It has been named the Cullinan.

GENERAL NOTES.

UPPER AIR EXPLORATION BY KITES ABOVE THE ATLANTIC.—In 1901 Mr. A. Lawrence Rotch, of the Blue Hill Observatory, flew a number of kites, with self-recording instruments attached, from a transatlantic steamer and obtained some valuable data about the circulation of the air in the higher regions of the atmosphere. In 1904 Professor Hergesell, on board the Prince of Monaco's Princess Alice, conducted a series of similar experiments above that portion of the Atlantic bounded by Spain, the Canaries and the Azores. An expedition has set out this year to repeat the above experiments and continue them further southward, and will proceed towards the equator by way of Madeira, the Canary and Cape Verde Islands. Hydrogen balloons will be used to supplement the kites. Mr. Henry H. Clayton, meteorologist at Blue Hill, made some flights on his passage across the Atlantic on the Romanic.

MEETING OF THE BRITISH ASSOCIATION IN SOUTH AFRICA.—The British Association for the Advancement of Science met this year at South Africa. The inaugural address of Professor G. H. Darwin, son of the great naturalist, was delivered partly at Cape Town on August 15 and partly at Johannesburg on August 30. The various

other addresses were delivered in these two places and in others to which the party proceeded. Several American scientists, among them Professor W. M. Davis, of Harvard, and Professor Scott, of Princeton, were among the delegates.

THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION.—This association, which is gradually uniting the 140,000 physicians in this country into a compact body, held its annual meeting during the week of July 10 at Portland, Oregon. The new president is Dr. William J. Mayo, of Rochester, Minn., one of the foremost among American surgeons. He has persistently declined all calls to large cities or institutions, and has remained in a small town, which boasts of a hospital—St. Mary's—built by the Franciscan Sisters for his father, and where he is one of the surgeons. The doctors present at the meeting devoted a whole morning to the discussion of the work of Dr. Chittenden, of which an account was given in the *Chronicle* of the October issue of the *QUARTERLY*, and which will have a marked influence on future medical practice in regard to nutrition.

M. J. AHERN, S. J.

Boston College, Boston, Mass.

Book Reviews

THE GENTLE SHAKESPERE. A vindication. By *John Pym Yeatman*, of Lincoln's Inn, Esquire, etc., author of the "History of the Common Law of Great Britain," etc. Third edition (augmented). 8vo., pp. about 475. New York: The Shakespeare Press. Birmingham: Moody Brothers.

This is a remarkable book in more ways than one. It is a formidable looking volume, and one's first thought in regard to it, that it contains the life work of a Shakespeare student who has devoted much time to study and research. But at the very beginning he is met with this statement by the author: "I have written this book with but very little preparation, and with only a previous very general knowledge of the work of Shakespeare." Before one has quite recovered from his surprise, he is still more startled to learn that just three weeks were spent in the making, and that the purpose of the author is to correct the errors of others with an unsparing hand. Here are his words:

"The book has taken me just three weeks to write. In it I have somewhat boldly attempted to correct the errors of others with an unsparing hand, but only with a view to the elucidation of the truth. If others will take the trouble to take the rod in hand, and correct mine, I shall not repine. I am not ashamed to confess that reading Mr. Donnelly's book I accepted much of its conclusions; although by testing his 'cryptogram' I soon found it to be nonsense, and now, through this investigation, I have discovered the absurd blunders upon which his arguments are based, I entirely reject his teaching, and can only wonder that I could have been misled by it. It is with great satisfaction that I bring these facts to light, and assist in some measure to sweep away the rubbish that has been heaped upon the grave of William Shakespeare, not by Donnelly only, but by the many who have rashly ventured to write about him."

The unsparing hand is very much in evidence here, and no doubt the author's wish that his errors shall be corrected by others, even as he corrects the errors of others, will be fully gratified.

The book is made up of several parts not necessarily connected and with a quotation of the first four acts of "Henry VIII." almost entire. We have culled from the preface of the book proper a group of quotations which follow one another so closely as to form a consecutive whole, and they summarize pretty completely the text that follows:

"One of the objects of this book is to place before the reader a true account of a great poet—the greatest, perhaps, that the world

ever saw—and, if possible, to relieve his memory from the mass of misrepresentation, calumny and even unreasoning adulation which has been piled upon it.

“As most certainly no one man ever brought together so many beautiful and noble ideas, or expressed them so worthily or so naturally, no one has ever yet excited so much comment and inquiry, or has caused such a multitude of books to be written about himself and his works, it might be thought that it is superfluous and unnecessary to add another to the pile; that the limit of the great library which has been created to his honor has been reached, and that the wise gentlemen who have assumed to themselves the power of controlling thought and of defining theories respecting William Shakespere—in other words, of settling controversies and stifling honest discussion—should be respected in their office and troubled no more with ‘vague possibilities and wild conjectures;’ but in truth the true limit of discussion has not been closed; nay, it has hardly been reached, for the simple reason that as yet, despite the multitude of accounts we possess, there are none based upon the truth; the premises upon which they are built have been wrongly assumed. We know almost as little of the true man as if he had been a myth. Indeed, some of the shrieking schools declare that as an author he had no existence; that there was such a man as Will Shakespere is not absolutely denied, but that he ever wrote a line of the magnificent lyrics called his, or of the marvelous plays which have been published under his name, they utterly deny. There was, indeed, it may be conceded, a common, indeed, a very common and improper person, called William Shakespere in the time of Queen Elizabeth, a low drinking, pot-house fellow; he may have been an actor (but if such only a poor one); he was an intelligent rustic who lived in pot-houses and usually slept under hedges after his carousals, and they point with satisfaction, and in proof, to a certain crabapple tree (in Warwickshire) still called after his name, and, sad to say, loved by the common people because it is said that the drunken lout once slept under it.

“Perhaps more objectionable than the shrieking school, because more misleading, are the orthodox writings of the sages—the self-constituted ‘authorities on Shakespere’—of whom Halliwell-Phillips is a mighty chieftain. They write with authority; they have in their breast all that can possibly be known concerning the man. No one can, or shall, go a step further in the search of truth concerning him. But, alas! reading these great authorities does not bring either conviction or peace to the mind.”

In a very able and interesting review in the *QUARTERLY* of April, 1864, the writer remarked: “How few of all who read Shake-

spere's works have any conception of the man. He who of all poets comes nearest home to us, with his myriad touches of nature, is the most remote in his own personality," and he adds, "the sonnets of Shakespeare afford us, if we can but understand them aright, the most certain means whereby we can get at the man. Our difficulty is to get the right interpretation of the sonnets, and know where Shakespeare is really speaking in his own person."

There is an almost insuperable barrier to this mode of measuring their author. We have not a perfect copy of his poems, nor have we an undiluted copy of his plays. Unhappily Shakespeare did not publish either in his lifetime, nor, so far as we know, did he leave any manuscript prepared or intended for publication behind him. We do not even know positively whether he ever contemplated publication.

Shakespeare was tolerated, though a Catholic, because of his inimitable wit and lively humor, which pleased even the proud Protestant Queen, and curiously several of the players, some of his own relations and associated with him, were Catholics like him and were driven to this life probably from the fact that no other was open to them. In it they were tolerated on account of their cleverness, for although some of them were members of the University, they could not practice at the bar or in the other learned professions. We shall see presently how Shakespeare hated Queen Elizabeth, in spite of her toleration and her patronage to himself, with the hate of one of a proscribed sect.

When we remember that he was a Catholic, and that his mother and her family were strict Catholics, that his father's family must have been intensely Catholic from the fact—which will be shown presently—that they were closely connected with a monastic institution, and that they lost their income, their homes and their position through the "Reformation," we cannot doubt as to the mode of his bringing up; and it must be remembered that, although in principle a Catholic, yet mixing as he did in the world, he might have been a Protestant in his practices.

Surely it is a great thing to know that the poet came of an ancient and honored race, and that if the story of his youthful indiscretions have not been highly colored because of his renown—little people are so fond of sticking their own weaknesses upon the characters of the great—that at all events they were not hereditary or family faults, but the outcome of an exuberant temperament, unhappily unchecked by proper control, and let us hope that these bad habits were thrown off—if they ever existed—as quickly as they were assumed. Let us get at the fact that our poet was a gentleman by birth and education, and decent people will only too gladly throw

a veil over his youth and regard him as the pure and honorable man that he was when he came to the years of discretion, and utterly disregard and repudiate the slanders and detractions of his enemies and pretended friends. Well might he exclaim in reference to so many of his late admirers: "Oh, save me from my friends."

"LES SAINTS:" Saint Columban (vers. 540-615), par l'Abbe Eug. Martin, pp. vi., 198. Saint Francis de Borgia (1510-1572), par Pierre Suau, pp. v., 204. Lecoivre, 90 Rue Bonaparte, 1905.

These two latest additions to the well-known series "The Saints" have a special importance not less from an apologetical than from a devotional and historical point of view. All heroes of sanctity are, of course, living embodiments of the efficacy and in so far also of the reality and rationality of Catholic faith; but the giant form of the great Irish missionary Columbanus stands out with peculiar lustre in the midst of an age of darkness—radiant with the power that made him an apostle of faith, that proved its validity by marvelous deeds of beneficence for the temporal as well as the spiritual lives of his contemporaries. On the other hand, the illustrious Borgia exhibits the personal argument for faith with special cogency at a time when the very splendors of purely secular culture seemed to blind the sight of vast multitudes of men to the argument of things that appear not and the substance of things that are only hoped for.

Columbanus precedes St. Benedict as the great promotor of the monastic life and the Christian civilization which it produced and developed in the West. He did not confine himself to peopling monasteries with choirs of the devout. His cloisters were the universal seminaries whence issued the saviors of civil society. He furnished priests and Bishops and apostles no less than the judges and protectors of secular life. In the luminous pages of his recent biography the figure of this great representative of early Western monasticism is seen in its heroic mould and its striking historic background. At the same time the portrait is not idealistic. The author is no mere panegyrist. In Columbanus no less, probably more than in most other saints, sanctity covered a man. The ardent apostle was exceedingly human. He had strange peculiarities, we may call them eccentricities, which it is hard from our times and standards to explain. These human elements in the saint's character are given, it need hardly be said, their due proportion in the present biography, and when thus seen in their true relation they rather enlarge than diminish their possessor, while they certainly bring him closer to the reader's capacity of appreciation and

possibilities of imitation—a position the attainment of which is, after all, the ultimate purpose of “the lives of the saints.”

What may be called the realistic side of biography—a feature that particularly characterizes this series of biographies—is notably exemplified in Père Suau’s “Life of St. Francis Borgia.” There are a number of other biographies of the saint, but they are for the most part engrossed with his religious life. They take their subject mainly at his conversion and passing over his prior career follow him during his subsequent occupations as a member and general of the Society of Jesus. The present biography devotes about half of its space to his earlier history—to his home life, his life at the Spanish court prior to his conversion and to his character and deeds as a political ruler—while the second half, treating mainly of his career as a disciple of St. Ignatius, keeps close to the actual historical surroundings wherein he labored. This concreteness of method enables one to see the relations of the saint to his environment, and yet it in no wise lessens one’s realization of the supernatural character and power of his interior life.

While there is an obvious advantage in reading these biographies in the original French, it is to be hoped that they will soon be given a wider circulation by a worthy English translation.

ST. CATHERINE DE RICCI. *Her Life, Her Letters, Her Community.* By F. M. Capes. Preceded by a Treatise on the Mystical Life, by F. Bertrand Wilberforce, O. P., Preacher General of the Order. 8vo., xlv.+282. Burns & Oates, London, W.

“St. Catherine de Ricci, one of the three canonized Dominican women of the ‘Third Order,’ holds a different position from that of either her great predecessor and namesake of Siena or the saint of the New World who was a little girl when she died, Rose of Lima. These two were ‘tertiaries’ in the strict sense of the word, remaining inmates of their respective parent houses to the end of their lives.

“St. Catherine de Ricci, on the contrary, was not only a ‘conventual’ tertiary, but she belonged to a community which, although of the third order, was enclosed behind a grille and led a strictly contemplative life. Its members had nothing to do with hospitals, orphanages, schools or any kind of charitable institutions, doing no ‘active’ work except what was absolutely needful for their own support—such as needlework or confectionery, etc., which they sold, and even these occupations were lessened as far as possible under Catherine’s rule, to give more time for prayer. In fact, had it not been that their constitutions were of a less severe nature as to fast and abstinence, the sisters of her convent might almost as well have

belonged to the second order as to the third. Hence it is as a model rather of a contemplative nun than of what we in England usually understand by a conventual tertiary that this contemporary of St. Philip Neri and St. Mary Magdalen de Pazzi must be regarded.

"Again, wide as was her acquaintance with 'seculars' of every kind, so that her life was by no means a hidden one, like St. Rose's, the nun of Prato was not a great historical character like St. Catherine of Siena, whose wonderful vocation was clearly inconsistent with a cloistered life. Catherine de Ricci had great fame in her own country, but it was more for her extraordinary mystical life than for any of her personal actions that people were drawn to her, at least to begin with; though, when they came to know her, the beauty of her character and the good that she did to others with true Dominican activity of mind and heart warmly attached them to her. She was a prioress of her convent for a great part of her life, and as such was renowned for her wise and holy government. Thus her position with regard to the public lies, as it were, between that of the other two saints. Her life, we may say, contains a triple interest—that of a pure mystic, that of a practical religious superior in her own community and that of an essentially loving and tender woman, spreading beneficent influence around as far as the circumstances of her calling allowed."

The book is made up largely of the letters of the saint.

"These letters form, it need hardly be said, a particularly valuable portion of the present work, by enabling the saint to speak to us herself from behind her grille of three centuries ago. It would perhaps be impossible to characterize them more truly than a Dominican doctor in theology, Pere Berthier, has done in this pithy antithesis: 'These simple and practical letters of the nobly-born Catherine de Ricci form a fitting pendant to the grand—we might almost say aristocratic—style of Catherine of Siena, the dyer's daughter.'"

HANDBOOK OF HOMERIC STUDY. By *Henry Browne, S. J., M. A.*, New College, Oxford Fellow of the Royal University of Ireland, Professor of Greek at University College, Dublin. With twenty-two plates. 12mo., pp. 333. Longmans, Green & Co., London, New York and Bombay. 1905.

"An apology can hardly be required for any effort, however feeble, towards lessening the difficulties of Homeric study and making it a little more intelligent. In his two-fold capacity of learner and teacher, the writer has found that at the very threshold of his task a student is confronted with a mass of complex problems which hardly grow less entangled as he proceeds. He cannot

ignore them if he would, unless he be contented with merely translating the poetry line by line; his ordinary commentaries, handbooks of literature and history, his very dictionaries teem with allusions to controversial topics, and may often contain statements which are mutually destructive as well as overconfident. In this matter of decisiveness there is a danger of defect as well as of excess, and I can scarcely hope in my own pages to have steered successfully between the two extremes. On the one hand, it is less important for a beginner to have a cut and dried solution of his difficulties (even were this possible) than to feel their true inwardness, to recognize the mutual relations and to grasp the lines by which he might hope to reach a tolerable solution of them. Hence it has been constantly my concern to lay before the reader the elements out of which could be formed a judgment of his own, rather than to force him to conclusions to which I find myself inclined.

This outline of the author's purpose must command the approval of every teacher and student, for it goes to the very foundation of education—the training of the mind. Of course we abstract for the moment from moral training. It is not our purpose, nor have we the time or space to review this book in detail, but a glance at the very first page convinces us by analogy that the author is a true teacher. He says:

"With regard to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* it will suffice at the outset to give a few descriptive remarks which may help towards that single and comprehensive view of the poems which it is not easy on account of their length and complexity for the beginner to acquire, and without which he will hardly approach his subject with intelligence and zest."

That is exactly what our teacher of Virgil did not do for us, and we can never quite forgive him the weary months of drudgery which followed as we groped in the dark, jumping foolishly from book six to book twelve, and then back to book two, and *finally* ending with book one.

We realize from experience the necessity of a handbook like the one before us, and we hope that it will brighten the pages which too often in our schools and colleges are dark almost to blackness.

LETTERS ON CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. By *F. M. De Zuluetta, S. J.* 8mo., pp. 414. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati and Chicago. 1905.

"The volume here presented consists of little else than a reprint, with slight rearrangement, of the 'Letters on Christian Doctrine'

which for a few years past have been appearing monthly in the pages of the *Stella Maris* magazine, supplement to the *English Messenger of the Sacred Heart*. These 'letters' are here collected for the first time by the kind permission of Father D. Bearne, S. J., editor of both the aforesaid monthlies.

"It seems but due to the widely cherished memory of the late Father John G. Gretton, S. J., that the writer should disabuse his many kind and encouraging readers in the past of any impression they may have gathered that with him originated the idea of issuing 'letters' of the present kind. It was Father Gretton who conceived the same and embodied it in a series of 'Monthly Letters to Catholic Seamen,' published in a leaflet form at the *Messenger* office, Wimbledon. The writer did no more than take up the work at the point where Father Gretton had discontinued it—namely, at the end of the Third Commandment of the Decalogue—and at a time when the original leaflet had, under Father Bearne's editorship, developed into a prosperous magazine—the *Stella Maris*.

"But as the said monthly leaflets were penned chiefly for seamen, it seemed advisable for the purpose of this collection to rewrite the explanations of the first three Commandments, as well in order to meet the needs of a wider and more miscellaneous circle of readers as for giving greater homogeneity of treatment to the whole series.

"The aim of these 'Letters on Christian Doctrine' is to supplement the more elementary instruction in Catholic belief and morals which is afforded by the ordinary annotated Catholic catechism, and in some respects to go beyond the range of excellent manuals of religious instruction in which the catechism receives fuller development. This programme clearly implies that the present letters are designed mainly for such as are already past childhood, and who are either drawing towards full age or perhaps have already entered upon the serious work of life."

The series is confined to the Commandments of God and the precepts of the Church.

THE VALERIAN PERSECUTION. A study of the relations between Church and State in the third century, A. D. By Rev. Patrick J. Healy, D. D., of the Catholic University of America. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., The Riverside Press, Cambridge.

"Recent investigation into the relations between the Christian Church and the Roman State during the first three centuries of our era has thrown much new light on the history of this long period of persecution, and has served to show that the opposition to Christianity on the part of the Roman authorities arose from deep-seated adherence to time-honored state policy rather than from

blind hatred for the followers of the new religion. This view of the subject does not tend to diminish belief in the intensity and bitterness of the struggle, while it brings into clearer light the herculean task which confronted the first Apostles of Christianity in promulgating doctrines which were to revolutionize all old ideas regarding the political, social, moral and religious relations of mankind. Bearing in mind the peculiar character of pagan society in antiquity, its cohesiveness and absolutism, and its claims to complete domination over all human affairs, it will be manifest how easily a propaganda which aimed at disintegrating this autocratic exercise of power could be construed into treason to the state. The persecution which took place during the reign of the Emperor Valerian was, in a sense, the most critical period in the history of the Church during the first three centuries. The policy of complete extermination formulated by the Emperor Decius, which was the first systematic attempt to destroy Christianity, was never adequately tested, as the premature death of that Emperor prevented the full carrying out of his plans. In the case of Valerian the same policy prevailed; it was in force for a longer period, and it was put into operation at a time when the Church was still staggering under the blows inflicted by Decius. The meagre list of martyrs whose names are known to us as victims of this persecution affords no indication as to the actual number of those who suffered death, banishment or confiscation at the hands of the Roman authorities. There is no complete history in English of these three centuries of Christian trial. In fact, outside the pages of M. Paul Allard's monumental work on the persecutions there is no systematic presentation of this subject in any language."

If apology were needed for the appearance of this book, sufficient has been said. The subject is intensely interesting; the author wrote under the direction of the best masters at the Catholic University of America; his style is simple, clear and very attractive, and his references are numerous and, we are willing to believe, accurate. Such a combination ought to produce good historical work. It has done so.

ENGLISH MONASTIC LIFE. By *Abbot Gasquet, O. S. B., D. D., D. Litt., F. R. Hist. S.* Second edition, revised. 8vo., pp. xix. + 325. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago.

Anything from the learned pen of the Abbot Gasquet is sure of a royal welcome, because his reputation for accuracy is beyond question. In the present instance his work is fully as accurate as usual, though not so learned, because the purpose did not demand it, as may be gleaned from the preface:

"This volume does not appear to call for any lengthy preface. It should introduce and explain itself, inasmuch as, beyond giving a brief account of the origin and aim of each of the orders existing in England in pre-Reformation days, and drawing up a general list of the various houses, all I have attempted to do is to set before the reader, in as plain and popular a manner as I could, the general tenor of the life lived by inmates in any one of those monastic establishments. In one sense the picture is ideal, that is, all the details of the daily observance could not perhaps be justified from an appeal to the annals or customs of any one single monastery. Regular or religious life was never, it must be borne in mind, such a cast-iron system, or of so stereotyped a form that it could not be, and for that matter frequently was, modified in this or that particular, according to the needs of places, circumstances and times. Even in the case of establishments belonging to the same order or religious body this is true, and it is, of course, all the more certainly true in regard to houses belonging to different orders. Still, as will be explained later, the general agreement of the life led in all the monastic establishments is so marked that it has been found possible to sketch a picture of that life which, without being perhaps actually exact in every particular for any one individual house, is sufficiently near to the truth in regard to all the houses in general. The purposes for which the various parts of the monastery were designed and were used, the duties assigned to the numerous officials, the provisions by which the well-being and order of the establishment were secured, the disposition of the hours of the day and the regulations for carrying out the common conventual duties, etc., were similar in all religious bodies in pre-Reformation days, and, if regard be paid to the changed circumstances, are still applicable to the monastic and religious establishments now existing in England."

The illustrations, especially those showing the costumes of the various orders, add much to the value of the work, while the list of English religious houses has great historic value. A series of maps follows this list, showing the location of the houses of the different communities.

THE STORY OF THE CONGO FREE STATE. Social, Political and Economic Aspects of the Belgian System of Government in Central Africa. By *Henry Wellington Wack, F. R. G. S.* (member of New York Bar). 8vo., pp. xv., 684. With 125 illustrations and maps. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

"As a student of Mid-African affairs for the past seven years, and a close observer of the rapid progress toward complete civilization now being made in that part of the world, I have felt it my duty to

lay before my countrymen the true and complete story of the conception, formation and development of the Congo Free State." The author goes on to state how he was moved to take up this work by the campaign of calumny being carried on by English merchants interested in the rubber trade, against King Leopold's government, which they accused of cruelty and oppression. In this campaign they made use of English religious organizations, and not satisfied with the harm they were doing at home, they extended the campaign to this country. It was then that the present work was undertaken in the interest of truth.

The author tells how he obtained from King Leopold, after presenting the proper credentials, free access to the archives of the administration of the Congo Free State in Brussels, and how he was left free to write the story in his own way, without interference or suggestion from the King or any of his ministers. The result is a true story, told in a most interesting manner, and of real historic value. The author says: "That this story is true, I have satisfied myself in every particular. It is the story of a great colonizing undertaking founded upon modern social science." Here we see the Catholic missionary at his best, for the story of the Congo Free State civilization is a story of Catholic civilization. The illustrations are admirably done.

SAINTS AND FESTIVALS OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. By *H. Pomeroy Brewster*, author of "The Cross in Iconography," etc. 8vo., pp. 558. Illustrated. New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company.

The history of the book is told in the following words from the publisher's note:

"A considerable part of the matter presented in the following pages was printed in a series of articles in the *Union and Advertiser*, of Rochester, N. Y.

"The absolute truthfulness of these articles from both archæological and historic standpoints as well as their entire freedom from all denominational bias, with the knowledge of profane and ecclesiastical history and canon law shown in them, at once attracted a wide circle of readers and won the hearty approval of the clergy and laity of both Protestant and Roman branches of the Christian Church. On their completion, at the request of many eminent divines, the author has carefully revised the entire work, adding to the original MSS. much valuable material, and he has thus produced what is practically a Church year book, in which is told the origin, history and present status of each of the chief festivals of the entire Christian Church as well as of a number of local feasts and festivals which

obtain in certain parts of Europe. While it is beyond the scope of the present work to attempt to tell the story of every one of the numerous canonized saints whom the Church has chosen to honor, the author has each day throughout the year selected a few of the most noted among them and made brief sketches of the lives of those who are remembered on that day. But in the alphabetical index are given the name and 'saint-day' of a far more comprehensive list, while in the general index will be found the names of those especially mentioned."

The book is extremely interesting and instructive, and is particularly notable for the explanations with which it abounds of ancient customs, odd terms and doubtful symbols. The quaint illustrations, made especially to accompany the text and very seldom met with elsewhere, add a great deal to the value of the work. The author shows real love for his subject by his extensive research.

NOTES ON CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. By *Most Rev. Edward G. Bagshawe, D. D.*, Archbishop of Seleucia. Second edition. 12mo., pp. 287. London: Kegan Paul; Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd., Dryden House, 43 Gerard street, London, W.

"The following 'Notes on Christian Doctrine' are notes from which about forty years ago I gave lectures on Christian doctrine to the students at Hammersmith Training College. I endeavored to put into a small compass as many theological truths, dogmatic and moral, as circumstances permitted. I have done my best, both then and in a recent revision, to make them exact and correct. How far I have succeeded it is for others to judge."

These notes are necessarily brief, covering as they do so wide a field. They include the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Angelic Salutation, the Commandments, the sacraments and the sacramentals. For the same reason they are confined to short but clear statements of doctrine without going into argument or quotation. As a brief summary they are excellent.

LIVES OF THE ENGLISH MARTYRS. Declared blessed by Pope Leo XIII. in 1886 and 1895. Written by the Fathers of the Oratory, of the Secular Clergy, and of the Society of Jesus. Completed and edited by Dom Bede Camm, O. S. B., of Erdington Abbey. Vol. II, "Martyrs Under Queen Elizabeth." 8vo., pp. xlii. + 691. Burns & Oates, Ltd., London.

As was said here when the first volume of this work was noticed, the record is a sad but inspiring one. It brings before us in a startling manner the blinding power of lust which lay at the foundation of the English Reformation—so-called—and the small number

of the elect. At the same time it shows us the power of faith which can move mountains to the astonishment of the shallow-minded, but which can strengthen the martyr to give up his life, on the gallows or at the stake, without exciting more than ridicule in the worldling. For the true Christian, however, these pages are full of inspiration. In these martyrs he sees his brethren, the worthy successors of the early heroes of Christianity, who preach to him patience and perseverance from their thrones in heaven. The publication of their lives in this form at the present time is particularly appropriate for England, where serious minded men are turning their thoughts in ever increasing number towards the mother Church, from whose bosom their ancestors were torn or driven. We need such narratives in our own midst, because we are very far away from the spirit of sacrifice which leads to the martyr's crown.

ORDO DIVINI OFFICII RECITANDI MISSAEQUE CELEBRANDIAE, etc. Pro anno Domini MCMVI. Fr. Pustet & Co., New York and Cincinnati.

We were agreeably surprised by the arrival of this Ordo at this time. As the year draws to a close the need of the Ordo for the following year becomes more and more imperative. Indeed, it is hard to make arrangements for coming events without it. Pustet & Co. are noted for their promptness in this regard, and we congratulate them on living up to their reputation.

The Ordo is published in two forms—with and without the Roman office. We feel that it would be superfluous to speak of its intrinsic merits. Its history does that most eloquently. The publishers entered this field a few years ago, when it was already occupied by some one else who had been in possession from time immemorial. They have won the confidence of the ecclesiastical body very rapidly, and they have the expressed approbation of sixteen Bishops in addition to His Grace of New York. Their circle of readers widens each year, and no one who has used the book will need urging to induce him to continue. Orders may be sent at once to the publishers.

To avoid fine, this book should be returned on
or before the date last stamped below

20M-8-46

8
MAR 29 1954